Rev. Stearn

Dr. C. I. SCOFIELD'S QUESTION BOX

Compiled by

ELLA E. POHLE

For eleven years Assistant to Dr. Scofield in his Bible Correspondence School

---

CHICAGO

The Bible Institute Colportage Association

826 North La Salle Street

Helpful Books and Pamphlets

By Rev. C. I. Scofield, D. D.

Plain Papers on the Holy Spirit
16mo, paper, 15 cents net; cloth, 35 cents net.

Addresses on Prophecy
16mo, paper, 25 cents net; cloth, 50 cents net.

Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth
Being ten outline studies of the more important divisions of Scripture. 16mo, paper, 15 cents net; cloth, 30 cents net.

Galatians
12mo, paper, 15 cents net.

The New Life in Jesus Christ
12mo, paper, 25 cents net, postage 4 cents extra; cloth, 50 cents net, postage 6 cents extra.

The Truth About Heaven
18mo, paper, 10 cents net.

The Truth About Hell
18mo, paper, 10 cents net.

The World's Approaching Crisis
18mo, paper, 10 cents net.

The Scofield Reference Bible
$2.00 to $14.00, according to binding and edition. Send for descriptive catalogue.

Compiled by Ella E. Pohle
Dr. C. I. Scofield's Question Box
12mo, cloth, $1.25 net.

The Bible Institute Colportage Association
826 North La Salle Street, Chicago

COPYRIGHT, 1917
— BY —
THE BIBLE INSTITUTE COLPORTAGE ASSOCIATION
OF CHICAGO

FOREWORD

The questions and answers composing this volume were accumulated from years of correspondence between Dr. C. I. Scofield, of international renown as a Bible expositor, and his Bible Correspondence Course students and readers of the "Record of Christian Work." While not forming a complete compendium such as the author could produce with a work of this character in view, yet the "helps" herein contained are considered by many of his friends too valuable to lie unused. Hence, incomplete as it may seem to the modesty of the author, upon urgent request it has been deemed advisable to issue the material in book form, in order that not only Dr. Scofield's students and friends, but the multitudes who know him through the "Scofield Reference Bible," "Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth," and other books, may have the privilege of coming into the closer and more personal touch with the honored author that such a volume as this will give.

The work is therefore sent forth to feed the scattered sheep of God, with earnest prayer that those who love to gather about the sacred pages may have vision clarified and faith strengthened through the helps herein given, to the praise of the glory of His grace.

ELLA E. POHLE.

CONTENTS

	Page
Apparent Contradictions	9
Assurance	10
Baptism	15
Christian Conduct	20
The Church	30
Civic Righteousness	35
Death and the Eternal State	36
Evolution	44
Faith	46
The Holy Spirit	47
Inspiration	53
Israel and the Church	57
The Judgments	61
Kingdom Truth	63
Law and Grace	73
Manuscripts, Translations, etc.	81
Miscellaneous	86
Parables	106
The Person and Work of Christ	109
Prayer	113
Prophetic	114
The Rapture	127
Rationalism	130
Repentance	133
Resurrection	133
The Sabbath	135
Salvation	139
Sanctification	140
Satan	145
Science and the Bible	146
The Sin Question	149
Tongues (Speaking in)	153
The Tribulation	155
Types	157
Woman's Ministry	159

[For detailed "Subject Index" and "Scripture Index," see pages 161 to 166.]


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/drciscofieldsque0000ella_e4q9

DR. C. I. SCOFIELD'S QUESTION BOX

APPARENT CONTRADICTIONS

Is not the number of Israelites mentioned in Numbers 1:39 contradicted by the number given elsewhere?

The number given in Numbers 1:39 is a mistranslation for which we cannot account, as both the Septuagint and Hebrew have 22,300. It is well to remember that seeming contradictions are often due to mistranslations.

How can we reconcile Deuteronomy 24:16 with the destruction of the families of Achan, Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and instances of famine, plague and death falling upon the people because of the sin of one, e. g., in the case of Saul (2 Sam. 21:1, 2)?

The command of God in Deuteronomy 24:16 is in accord with that of Genesis 9:5, 6. The life of the guilty one alone was to be taken, and this command the rulers in Israel, and in fact all in authority in civilized lands, have obeyed (see, *e. g.*, 2 Kings 14:6; Ezek. 18:19). In the instances named, and in every such instance in the history of the race, it is God Himself acting upon His own divine prerogative. Nowhere nor ever is this prerogative delegated to man.

Numbers 14:34 speaks of God's "breach of promise." How do we reconcile this with the character of God?

See Numbers 14:22-35. It tallies perfectly with Deuteronomy 1:35, in the light of Numbers 14:23, 34—"breach of promise" meaning (see margin) "altering of my purpose." The covenant in Deuteronomy 5:3 is the *altered*

covenant: that spoken of in Deuteronomy 1:35 is the original covenant before it was altered in the wisdom of God.

Since God is unchangeable, how could He repent, as Genesis 6:6, 7 indicates?

The word "repent" here means "a change of mind," or "a changed mind." When applied to God, the word is used phenomenally, according to Old Testament custom. God *seems* to change His mind because He changes His method. The phenomena are such as, in the case of a man, would indicate a change of mind. It is part of the difficulty with which Deity must deal in attempting to explain Himself to finite minds.

In 1 Chronicles 2:13-15 Jesse is said to have seven sons and in 1 Samuel 16:10, 11, eight. How can this contradiction be reconciled?

The apparent contradiction between these passages cannot, perhaps, be satisfactorily removed in the present condition of the Hebrew text. The usual answer is that the genealogical tables in Chronicles are rather the official than the family tables and contain, as official records of births, marriages and deaths now do, many omissions. This does not impugn verbal inspiration, for all that can be demanded of inspiration is an accurate transcript of the Jewish genealogical records. Inspiration no more makes itself responsible for the exact truth of those records than for the exact truth of Satan's lie to Eve. Inspiration reports the matter accurately—that is all.

ASSURANCE

Does not Hebrews 6:4-6 teach that a believer can fall away and be lost?

First, we must remember that Hebrews was written to Jewish believers at a time while the temple was still stand-

ing (Heb. 10:11). Many Jews had embraced Christianity as a sect of Judaism merely, like the Pharisees and Essenes, but without perceiving that it was an exclusive religion which set aside Judaism and the Judaic sacrifices absolutely, leaving only Christ in their place. The whole body of Jewish Christians were therefore addressed as being on the ground of profession, hence the exhortations of which this passage is one. It will be remembered that in the Gospel of Matthew, which is also Jewish in its outlook from the 13th chapter on, the same exhortations frequently occur. The peculiar peril of the Jewish professor was that he might, having taken Christianity only superficially, give it up and go back to the sacrifices, which would be in effect "crucifying the Son of God afresh and putting him to an open shame."

The case supposed in the sixth chapter is not that of a mere unbeliever, because a mere sinner may at any time believe and turn to the Lord. The case is one of a person who has stood in the full blaze of gospel light; he has been made a "partaker" of the Holy Ghost" in His convicting power (John 16:8-10) and has therefore tasted of the word of God and of the powers of the age to come. The case is fully described by our Lord in Matthew 13:20, 21. The seed of the word has found lodgment in his emotional nature. Intellectually he is convinced. Now if such an one goes back instead of going on to believe and be born again, it is impossible to renew him again to repentance. We can never judge in any individual case, but warning is to be sounded out in the ears of professors, surely never more necessarily than in this day when so many are joining church after an emotional revival, without any real transaction with Jesus Christ about their sins. That this is not a true Christian who goes back and is lost is certain from the great passages which teach unqualifiedly that such a person cannot be lost, such as John 10:28, 29; Ephesians 4:30, etc.

As to falling from grace, *that* a good Christian may do, and that millions of Christians have done. They have lost the sense of the grace of God and are living under law; but falling from grace is not falling from salvation. It is losing the joy of assurance and going back under the cold shadow of the law. Also (2 Pet. 3:17), we all fall from our steadfastness. Again and again doubts as to God's providence and fatherly care overcome us—we fall into despair and unbelief in many ways, but we do not fall into hell nor out of the hand of God, who keeps us. The truth as to this whole matter, however, let me repeat, is to be ascertained first by distinguishing the Scriptures which relate to professors from those which relate to believers, and secondly, by establishing ourselves in the great truth of assurance.

Should not Protestants preach assurance of full salvation to all who believe in Jesus Christ—not to "those who have confessed their sins"?

Yes. Salvation is not through confession of sins, but through simple faith in Jesus Christ (John 3:16, etc.). Confession by a *believer* restores his fellowship when that has been broken by sin (1 John 1:10).

From 1 Corinthians 9:27 would it not seem as though Paul thought there was a possibility of losing his salvation?

Paul's apprehension was not that he might be a "castaway" in our present-day use of that word; but that he might be "disapproved" at the judgment seat of Christ, where the works of believers pass His scrutiny. This judgment occurs after the translation of the Church (1 Thess. 4:14, 17). The apostle had in mind the truth stated in 1 Corinthians 3:11-15.

How can we reconcile such passages as Romans 14:15 and 1 Corinthians 8:11, which state that a brother can be "destroyed" and "perish," with the teaching of the eternal security of believers?

To make the words "destroy" (Rom. 14:15) and "perish" (1 Cor. 8:11) mean the eternal destruction of a regenerate and justified believer through the eating of meat against conscience, under the example of a "stronger" brother, would be to negative the teachings of Christ and the apostles concerning the eternal security of the believer. The context seems to make clear what is in the apostle's mind. The early Gentile churches were planted in the midst of, and gained their converts from, idolatrous heathen. Doubtless many, as they heard the new gospel, were forsaking their idols under conviction of the inefficacy of idol worship, and of the sin of idolatry, who had not as yet fully come to Christ. But they had come amongst the disciples, and were, in charity, accounted "brethren." For such, it was of the utmost importance that their breach with the past should be complete. To see a strong and influential brother "sit at meat in the idol's temple" might well be the first link in a new chain which should bind them again to their idols. Then they would "perish."

Did the Old Testament saints (e. g., Saul and Solomon, who began so well) share in the eternal security of believers?

The eternal security of the believer is a New Testament doctrine and cannot be applied to Old Testament believers, who were under a covenant of works, not of grace. It is true indeed that the Old Testament believer was justified by faith (Heb. 11), but with that faith a perseverance in obedience was also necessary, else he lived under a broken and unpropitiated law, which was inexorable in its judgment. Not so with the believer, who is saved by grace, and

his disobedience does not affect his salvation, but his fellowship, peace and growth. As to Saul and Solomon, we can only leave them in the hands of a just God whom they at least began to serve.

How could one be a partaker of the Holy Ghost without being saved (Heb. 6:4-6)?

There is an incomplete faith which stops short of receiving Christ (John 1:12) and of final committal (2 Tim. 1:12). Our Lord speaks of this in Matthew 13:20, 21. The seed falls into the emotional nature,—"and anon with with joy," etc. After Pentecost, this incomplete experience might be,—often is, even deeper. Of this we have a description in this passage in Hebrews. There is a distinct work of the Spirit in conviction and enlightenment,—He even giving tastes of the "goodness of God" and of the powers of the coming age—healings, and the like,—but even then a soul sometimes draws back and fails to enter in, and it is impossible to "renew them again to repentance," etc. They have by this work of His, been "made partakers of the Holy Ghost," etc., but failing to go all the way, are lost without hope. Not that God is not willing to give them repentance or to receive them, but they are like Esau, who after rejecting the blessing, "found no place of repentance (or, literally, 'way to change his mind'), though he sought it (the blessing) carefully with tears" (see also Heb. 4:2; 10:26-29,39). That it cannot refer to a believer, see verse 9; also John 10:28, 29; 6:39; Philippians 1:6.

Does not the parable of the Talents in Matthew 25:14-30 teach that one once saved may be lost?

This is not a gospel parable, but a parable of the kingdom, which is the sphere of profession, made up of wheat and tares—good fish and bad fish, etc., etc. (Matt. 13). The unprofitable servant in Matthew 25:30 represents the

tares in the kingdom. Servants are being judged. Some are sons, some are not. No possessor of eternal life ever called his Master "a hard man." To no saved one, however unfaithful, could the Lord say at His appearing, "Cast ye him into outer darkness," after having said, when they received the gift of eternal life, "they shall *never* perish."

In Matthew, from chapter 13 on, the sphere of professed discipleship is in view. The profession may be sincere, or it may be merely formal. In the parable of the Virgins this profession is tested by the coming of the Lord; in the parable of the Talents, profession is tested by service. The foolish virgins and the unprofitable servant are mere professors.

BAPTISM

Does baptism take the place of circumcision in this dispensation?

The whole question of circumcision in relation to the Gentile believers in Christ in this dispensation came up before the council at Jerusalem, described in the 15th chapter of Acts. The thought of the Jewish believers in Christ was a very natural one. If the Jews must, in order to have the benefits of the Abrahamic covenant, receive circumcision, it naturally seemed to them that much more the Gentiles must receive the sign of that covenant if they were to share in its blessings. But the decision of the council at Jerusalem was that the Gentile converts did not need circumcision, and there is not in all that discussion a single hint of the notion that baptism takes the place of circumcision as a sign for Christians in this age. There is a theological teaching that as the Jews had circumcision in order to enter the Abrahamic covenant, so the Christian has baptism for the same purpose; but there is not one syllable of Scripture connecting baptism with the Abra-

hamic covenant. It is purely and only a theological concept. Baptism was a new ordinance instituted for believers of this age, as a public witness to identification with Christ.

What is the meaning of "baptized for the dead" in 1 Corinthians 15:29?

It does not mean baptized in behalf of the dead, as if, some having died after believing but before baptism, others took their place as proxies and received baptism in their behalf. The apostle's thought is of an army or procession of believers passing on to the presence of the Lord through death, and of baptism as the act of confession by which others took the places in the ranks which were left vacant by those who had fallen. It is as if a Union soldier during the Civil War had exclaimed: "If the union is to be destroyed, then those already dead in its defense are dead in vain, and what shall we do who are enlisted in their places?"

What is meant (Matt. 3:11) by being baptized "with fire"?

"With fire" (Matt. 3:11) refers to the Spirit, but in His office as (1) the Energizer of the believer's service, (2) the Purifier from evil within. Hence the exhortation (1 Thess. 5:19) "Quench not the Spirit," where "quench" means literally, "put not out the fire."

What was the difference between John's baptism and Christian baptism?

John's baptism was the voice of God to Israel, and the believing remnant responded (Matt. 3:5, 6; see also Acts 13:24 and 19:4). John's baptism required repentance or a change of mind concerning dead works—Abrahamic descent as meritorious (Matt. 3:9)—ceremonial righteousness to give place to practical righteousness (Luke 3:8-14); and all this in view of the imminence of the kingdom of

heaven, the chief characteristic of which is righteous doing.

Christian baptism has no reference to repentance, as a believer has already the changed mind concerning the person and work of Christ, but is a symbol of the believer's union with Christ in His death and resurrection.

Did John the Baptist and Jesus seek the same end in their preaching and baptism?

This question cannot be answered categorically. (1) Jesus did not baptize (John 4:2). (2) The inference is that Jesus' disciples baptized as did John "with the baptism of repentance" (Acts 19:4; Matt. 3:2) unto the kingdom "at hand," since both John and Jesus and His disciples preached the kingdom of heaven as "at hand" (Matt. 3:2; 4:17; 10:5-7). (3) But the preaching of Jesus and of John, alike in the message, "the kingdom of heaven is at hand," had this great distinction, that John's preaching was concerning "one who should come after him," while Jesus preached Himself as the One who had come. Doubtless the Judean ministry of Jesus laid the foundation doctrines of the grace to be preached to the whole world, but it required the death and resurrection of Jesus to give the facts upon which those doctrines could be preached (Rom. 3:24-26; 4:24; 5:9; 2 Cor. 5:18-21).

John's baptism brought his disciples into an attitude toward Christ of expectant faith (John 1:29-37; Acts 19:4).

Since Acts 19:5 asserts that the Ephesian disciples of John were re-baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, is it not reasonable to suppose that all of the disciples of John and Jesus were re-baptized after Pentecost?

There is no authority for affirming that all of John's disciples afterwards received Christian baptism. An assertion either way would rest upon a mere inference.

There is no vestige of authority for asserting that Jesus' disciples, made before the crucifixion, were re-baptized as they believed after the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit. If any of Jesus' followers had not really believed before Pentecost that He was "the Christ the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16; 1 John 5:1), but were among those who "gladly received his (Peter's) word" on the day of Pentecost, then such certainly were baptized on that day (Acts 2:41). But even if it be assumed that some of Jesus' disciples were not converted till after Pentecost—and it would be pure assumption, for no word of Scripture affirms it—it could not be positively affirmed that their baptism on that day was a "re-baptism," for except the Apostles John and Andrew, there is no evidence that any of Jesus' disciples were baptized by John the Baptist, though it is a reasonable conclusion that they were.

Is there any connection between the Old Testament ceremonial cleansing and John's baptism or the baptism of the Holy Spirit?

None whatever. The latter was unto repentance, while the former was for external transgressions, *e. g.*, coming in contact with a dead body, a leper, etc. In the ordinance of the red heifer (Num. 19), the water used signified cleansing from defilement (sin has two aspects—guilt and uncleanliness) and is a type of both the Spirit and the Word (John 7:37-39; Eph. 5:26). Neither is there any connection between John's baptism and the baptism of the Holy Spirit; the baptism with the Spirit unites believers to the body of Christ and imparts gifts for service.

John's appointment and mission were of God (Luke 1:13-18) and exceptional, as was his being filled with the Holy Ghost, the dispensation of the Holy Ghost not yet having been begun. There is but little light given in Scripture as to the how, why and wherefore of John's mission—we accept it as it is, coming as it does in the transitional

period from the dispensation of law to grace, and legitimate in a prophet, as one sent from God. His baptism was a form, signifying that the believer wished to be separated from his sinful habits. Many were baptized with John's baptism who were never saved, while all baptized with the *Spirit* had been saved.

Into how many baptisms does the believer enter?

A great deal of the confusion of mind concerning the word "baptism" disappears when we see that Christ was the subject of a three-fold baptism. First, He was baptized with water (Luke 3:21); second, He was baptized with the Holy Ghost by the Father (Luke 3:22); and thirdly, He was baptized with death on the cross (Luke 12:50). Every believer is, in this dispensation, identified with Christ in the last two of these baptisms (1 Cor. 12:12, 13; Matt. 20:22, 23), and every believer should be baptized with the first of these baptisms. The passage in Colossians 2:12 refers to the identification of the believer in the first, and Romans 6:4, 5, to the identification of the believer with Christ in the last of these baptisms.

How can there be remission of sins in baptism as suggested in Luke 3:3?

There can be no remission of sins in baptism apart from repentance, which means, in these passages, a change of mind on the part of the Jews concerning Christ, the Messiah whom they had crucified. Baptism is the outward confession of an inward change from unbelief to faith.

When repentance, faith and baptism in water were the fundamental conditions for receiving the baptism of the Spirit (Acts 2:38), was it not the baptism in water of the adult, and not infant baptism that is here meant?

Peter is addressing Jews in regard to their attitude toward Jesus. Undoubtedly it was the baptism of the adult which is here meant.

CHRISTIAN CONDUCT

How far is a Christian to purge himself from unbelievers, and would it involve church membership?

2 Corinthians 6:14-18 forbids the "unequal yoke" of believers with unbelievers for the reasons stated: Righteousness cannot have fellowship with unrighteousness, nor can light have communion with darkness. A "yoke" is that which unites two or more in a common purpose, and the passage therefore clearly forbids the marriage of believers with unbelievers, or business partnerships where the same "unequal" state exists. To make the passage teach the doctrine of the separation of believers from the churches is therefore to take the ground—alike uncharitable and untrue—that the churches are composed of unbelievers. Doubtless there are mere professors in the churches, and doubtless there are carnal sect-divisions among them, but that condition is clearly foreseen in Scripture, and the path of the obedient child of God pointed out. Looking on, as 2 Timothy does, to the last of the last days, the condition of the professing church is clearly disclosed. It has become a "great house." In the great house "there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and earth; and some to honor and some to dishonor" (2 Tim. 2:20).

What now is the path of the one who, at whatever cost, would be (whether of gold, silver, wood or earth) a vessel unto honor?

"If a man therefore purge himself from these (i. e., the vessels unto dishonor), he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified (or "separated"), and meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work" (2 Tim. 2:21).

There is not an intimation that the servant "unto honor" is to get out of the "great house," but to purge himself from vessels unto dishonor in the "great house."

Needless to say this often involves far more pain and persecution than would be incurred by withdrawing. The

message to Laodicea (Rev. 3:14-22) contemplates the church in her last and utterly apostate condition. The Lord is quite outside, and the church proud, boastful, self-satisfied—what the religious cant of the day calls "optimistic"—is really "poor, and miserable, and blind and naked." Yet, even here, the Lord, knocking at the door, says, "If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me."

It should be needless to add that there might easily be, nay, often is, such a condition of things in a local church as makes it impossible for a loyal child of God to remain connected with it. A church which suffers in its pulpit an apostate preacher who denies (however covertly) the full and absolute eternal being and deity of Jesus Christ, the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and salvation through faith in Jesus Christ without works; and which allows the practice as part of the church life and work of flagrant worldliness, is a church with which fellowship is impossible to an obedient child of God.

But *a* church is not *the* Church. What might often be a local necessity might not be a universal necessity.

It is either ignorance or arrogancy to say that the churches are so composed of unbelievers that the separation of 2 Corinthians 6:14-18 applies broadly to them. The writer believes that a majority of the members of those churches, evangelical in creed, which require the confession of faith in Jesus Christ as a condition of fellowship, is made up of sincere, though alas! unfed and untaught believers in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Since the church has become so largely apostate, should not true believers obey the call to "come out of her" (Rev. 18:4)?

The call, "Come out of her," is for the time immediately preceding the doom and destruction of Babylon. There is no "call" to come out of the churches. Even in the last and

worst state of the professing church—Laodicea—Christ stands at the door and knocks, saying, "If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me." In other words, Christ does not call His people out, but asks to be let in.

To just what extent is the prohibition "Judge not" to be followed?

The Bible in many places forbids us to judge one another, and in 1 Corinthians 4:5 discloses the reason. "Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring into light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." And this is but another way of saying that we are inhibited from judgment because we do not know, and cannot know, all of the facts. It was a great saying of Bushnell's, "The thing we shall be most ashamed of in eternity is our judgment of our brethren." But judgment implies condemnation, and the inhibition of judgment is not to be used to blur moral distinctions. Right is right, and wrong is wrong; and while we may not condemn our brethren, we may and must discern what is evil and refuse to fellowship it (2 Tim. 2:19; Eph. 5:1-11).

The fellowship of evil doctrine is even more sternly condemned in Scripture than the fellowship with evil practices (2 Thess. 3:14; 1 Tim. 6:3-5; Gal. 1:8, 9; 2 John 1:9-11).

How are we to reconcile David's hatred of his enemies, as seen in 2 Samuel 5:8, with the command to love our enemies?

The difficulty arises from applying the ethics of the Christian dispensation to the conduct of a man who was an executioner of the divine justice upon a corrupt race. It is not necessary to overpress the word "hateth." It implies no personal malice (see Luke 14:26).

How may we know the will of God for our lives?

Upon two conditions. First, consecration; which is yieldedness to the will of God before we know it. Note the order in Romans 12:1, 2. First, the presentation of the body (verse 1); second, the refusal of world conformity (v. 2); and, thirdly, the proving or knowing of the will of God (v. 2). And the second condition is, to ask God for the revelation of His will (James 1:5). Having honestly and in trustful confidence in God complied with these conditions, the responsibility is wholly upon Him. We need not ask how He will make his will known to us; and we must be especially careful not to prescribe to Him the means which He must use for the revelation of His will. It cannot be too strongly stated that to do so is to invade His sovereignty. Faith rests upon the confident assurance that God can speak loudly enough to make a willing child hear. Our part is to wait quietly until we are sure.

What can be done in a church where the people claim it is impossible to raise the pastor's salary without socials, fairs and outside solicitation?

The only biblical "means" of raising money for Christian uses is a converted hand in its own pocket. In the sphere of practical righteousness there is no subject more urgently demanding faithful testimony from ministers of the gospel. "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination unto the Lord." He has nowhere commissioned His servants to ask the world for money for Him. When the Son of God was on earth He toiled with his own hands for His support until His public ministry began, and then was ministered unto by converted and loving souls. It seems inconceivable that a self-respecting minister should consent to begging from the world, and to the pitiful trafficking of "socials," suppers, and the like, to provide means for his support.

The true course for a minister of Jesus Christ who finds himself in a church or community where such things are customary, is: (1) Lovingly to teach his people out of God's Word what is His will as to giving. (2) "In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves" (2 Tim. 2:25). (3) Lovingly to refuse to conform to that or any other unbiblical practice. Such a minister, be he ever so wise and patient, must prepare his soul for persecution. He may deny the inspiration of Scripture, the deity of Christ or the resurrection, and arouse less vindictive opposition. He will hear from the self-styled "Marthas" in no uncertain way. But let him possess his soul in patience, meekness and prayer, and God will give him a great victory.

In 1 Corinthians 5:11 did Paul mean that a Christian should separate himself entirely from a fellow Christian who was a drunkard, etc., and how is the judgment of verses 12 and 13 to be understood?

No. Paul meant that a Christian ought to separate from one who called himself a brother, but whose actions and life proved him to be otherwise—a mere professor, of which there were some in the early church, as now. He was to be excluded from the communion table until he repented. The word judge has a two-fold meaning, illustrated by a jury and a judge. The first judges the actions and words of the one on trial,—the latter pronounces sentence. God alone can judge in the latter sense. Those who are spiritual may judge or discern, in the former sense (1 Cor. 2:15)—judge actions, and separate from those whose lives are ungodly. But God alone is the judge to pronounce sentence on men.

Since Paul made vows, is it not right for Christians now to do the same?

The only instance of vow-making in the New Testament

is in Acts 21:18-26 where Paul, at the instance of James, ceremonially "purified himself" with four men who had "a vow on them." This cannot, however, be made a precedent for vowing in this dispensation. For, without asking whether the noble apostle to the Gentiles had not in this acted inconsistently with his own writings, it is to be observed, (1) that the ground upon which James urged Paul to "be at charges" with these men cannot possibly exist for any believer today. "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the law." In other words, James pleaded with Paul to comply with a ceremonial in order to avoid or remove a prejudice against himself. (2) The whole context shows that vowing belongs to the dispensation of law, and "ye are not under the law, but under grace" (Rom. 6:14). Law is the testing of man to demonstrate his utter incapacity to keep vows, or to do any other good thing. When this is demonstrated, grace, which is unmerited favor to a guilty, hell-deserving, sinful wretch, comes in and freely saves him. Being saved, he is dependent utterly upon the power of God to keep him (Heb. 7:25; 1 Pet. 1:5). He can do all things through Christ (Phil. 4:13), but he is to have no independent will such as is involved in making vows, "for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13). No wonder, then, that vow-making is not so much as mentioned in New Testament Scripture. One is not even to say he will go here or there without adding, "if the Lord will" (James 4:15).

How are we to understand the many references in 1 Corinthians to the carnal minded—unspiritual; are these saved or unsaved?

The duality in 1 Corinthians is not of saved and unsaved, believers and unbelievers, but of spiritual and carnal believers (3:1, etc.). In Hebrews the hortatory passages

have professors in mind; in 1 Corinthians such passages (*e. g.*, 6:19) have carnal Christians in mind.

In what sense is the believer to separate himself from the world?

The biblical thought of separation is from whatever is necessarily dishonoring to God. The Christian is separate from the world in that he does not make the world the object of his hopes and ambitions. He is separate from unbelievers in that he does not yoke himself with them in a common purpose. There is a deeper principle of separation stated in 2 Timothy, 2nd chapter: "But in a great house"—etc. Here obviously the thought is not so much of separation from the "great house," as from the vessels unto dishonor in the great house. In the application of these principles, each believer must under the light of the Word, act upon his own convictions.

How far can we depend upon conscience?

Only so far as it has been educated according to the Word of God. The Word is the only infallible guide to action. If your conscience troubles you on any question, to violate it would be sinful. But we must seek to educate our consciences, not by other people's consciences or views, but by the Word itself. One thing we dare not do, however, is to judge another for doing something which our conscience will not allow us to do. "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind," but follow Romans 14 concerning others.

Why the prohibition of things strangled, and of blood in Acts 15:20, and why is this not binding upon Christians today?

It would seem as though the thought was to guard the sacredness of the precious blood of Christ, even in type. Strangulation would produce death without the shedding

of blood; His blood was shed. To use blood as food would tend to make common that which Scripture had made sacred as a type of the precious blood of Christ as of "a lamb without spot or blemish."

As to all this being binding upon Christians today, we must remember that those were not authoritative commandments, since the council at Jerusalem had no authority to put the Church under law, but were counsels of grace having in view Jewish scruples and Gentile grossness. They were applications of the law of love stated in 1 Corinthians 10:31, 33. These applications must be made by every believer under his own conscience. The law of love is not a standard by which we may judge others, for such judgment the law of love expressly forbids.

Is the principle involved in 1 Corinthians 10:27 as to eating what is set before you, asking no questions for conscience's sake, one by which a Christian may be guided in these days, and to what extent?

There is no reason why the principle is not operative today. The principle of the verse mentioned is, that if a Christian guest is told concerning anything set before him something which would raise a question of conscience, then the Christian guest is not to eat. Such a question might arise about food prepared with alcoholic sauces, or about animal food cruelly slain. In the cases cited, the principle would be that the Christian guest would be under no obligation to ask questions about the food, but if such facts should be disclosed, the Christian should not eat.

How is Paul's injunction in 1 Corinthians 6:1-7, concerning brothers going to law against each other, to be considered?

The force of this passage is that Christians should not go to law with each other. Arbitration is suggested, but the passage is really ironical—a forcible way of showing how

offensive to the divine mind is that inability of some Christians to "take joyfully the spoiling of their goods" which leads them into law suits.

Is it not out of the divine order to use leavened bread for the celebration of the Lord's Supper in view of the fact that leaven is always a type of evil?

Bread for the communion of the Lord's Supper should, we believe, be unleavened. And this for two reasons: (1) The bread used by our Lord in the institution of the supper was the bread of the passover, which was required to be unleavened (Ex. 12:18). (2) The bread symbolizes Christ's body, which was sinless, "unleavened." It should be added, however, that these considerations do not constitute a new Leviticus—a new ceremonial law—but are matters concerning which every Christian must be "fully persuaded in his own mind."

Does not John 13 make it clear that foot-washing is a scriptural ordinance?

It is, we think, an entire misapprehension of the meaning of our Lord's action to make an ordinance of the literal washing of feet. His words in verse 7 show that his action was symbolical: "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." For Peter certainly knew that his Lord was washing his feet. What he did not know was the spiritual meaning of that act. In effect our Lord explains, in verses 8 and 10, the spiritual significance of what He had done. "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part (partnership, communion) with me." "He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet" (R.V.). It is, in a word, the great truth taught typically in the tabernacle worship. There is first atonement at the brazen altar and then cleansing at the laver. The guilt of sin is removed by Christ's sacrifice, but as we walk through a world like this we contract defilements. We do not, in such case, need to be saved

over again (i. e., "bathed," verse 10), but we need to be cleansed. "He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet." The same truth precisely is taught in Ephesians 5:25-27. The feet-washing of John 13 symbolizes the "washing of water with the word" of Ephesians 5. It is also the truth of 1 John 1:9: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

But verses 14 and 15 teach the important additional truth that in this work we may and should serve one another. The washing is "by the word," and we may often wash a brother's feet by calling attention to some neglected truth or precept of Scripture. "If a brother be overtaken by a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness" (Gal. 6:1). "In meekness instructing them that oppose themselves (as Peter, who said, 'Thou shalt never wash my feet'), if peradventure God may give them repentance" (2 Tim. 2:25).

Is it possible to give one or more Scripture references which tell precisely what one must do to become consecrated?

Yes. See Romans 6:13, "Yield yourselves (the ego, selfhood, inner self, including spirit and soul) unto God; . . . and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." This yieldedness is (1) an act (Rom. 12:1, 20) and (2) a state,—"yet not I" (Gal. 2:20); "always bearing about in the body the putting to death of the Lord Jesus" (2 Cor. 4:10). The definite act of yielding is the beginning of a state of yieldedness. That is consecration. If the state of yieldedness is departed from by a lapse into self will, the remedy is not "re-consecration" (of which Scripture knows nothing), but confession.

THE CHURCH

If the Song of Solomon is a picture of Christ and His bride, could the Jews appreciate or understand it?

We must remember that many promises in the Old Testament connect Israel in a brideship relation with Jehovah, just as the New Testament promises connect the Lord Jesus Christ in His character as the Lamb, with the Church in a brideship relation. Such Old Testament passages as Hosea 2:2 and Jeremiah 31:32 and Isaiah 54:5 illustrate this. You will see, therefore, that a godly Jew could find much in the Song of Solomon upon which to feed his heart in tender love of Jehovah, but the blessings of Israel under the law were all tentative and conditional, and Israel fell in this relation.

There is indeed a promise with regard to Jehovah, the covenant God of Israel—that that relation shall be restored, (Hosea 2:14-23) yet in the Church as the bride of the Lamb, is found the complete fulfillment of all the beautiful imagery of the Song. There is nothing in the Song, obviously, which prefigures the Church as the body of Christ, so that it remains true that the Old Testament does not see the Church; but as the Old Testament constantly leaves room for the Church, so in this beautiful book, now that we have the New Testament revelation, we may see the very heart of Christ toward His bride.

What is meant by "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"—the Church, in Matthew 16:18?

"Hades," as the word hell should be translated, is the place to which the dead go—entering, as the figure has it, through the "gates." There is no thought of forces issuing from hades to "attack" the Church, for hades is not the abode of Satan and the fallen angels (demons) but, simply, of the dead. The promise therefore means that the whole Church will not go into hades—the place of the dead.

Why is not the gift of healing being used universally in the church today?

Healing is one of the gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:9), but, like all gifts, it is bestowed not upon all, but "as he will" (1 Cor. 12:11).

Why did the early church need so many exhortations on morality?

The Greek converts especially would have but little conscience as to the sinfulness of matters relating to the moral life, for morality was not in their code of living. "To lie like a Greek," for instance, was a common expression. Therefore they needed constant instruction and exhortation. By idol pollution Paul had in mind, doubtless, the heathen custom of eating meat offered unto idols, which subject he deals with fully in Romans 14.

To what does the phrase, "the heavenlies" (Eph. 2:6), refer?

That which is heavenly in contradistinction to that which is earthly. The sphere of the believer's spiritual experience as identified with Christ in nature (2 Pet. 1:4); life (Col. 3:4; 1 John 5:12); relationships (John 20:17; Heb. 2:11); service (John 17:18; Matt. 28:20); suffering (Phil. 1:29; 3:10; Col. 1:24); inheritance (Rom. 8:16, 17) and future glory in the kingdom (Rom. 8:18-21; 1 Cor. 2:9; Rev. 1:6; 5:10). The believer is a heavenly one,—a stranger and pilgrim on the earth (Heb. 3:1; 11:13; 1 Pet. 2:11).

If the seven churches in Revelation 2 and 3 represent epochs in the history of the professing church to the end, and if we are now in the Laodicean period, where do Sardis and Philadelphia belong?

Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea are not so much periods as phases. The professing church had become

Thyatira (Papacy). Then the Protestant Reformation (Sardis) occurred. Sardis is shown, not in the bright morning of the Reformation, but in the period of its arrest. "I have found none of thy works fulfilled" (Rev. 3:2). But Sardis (Protestantism) goes on to the end under two phases, Philadelphia and Laodicea. It is not that a certain body or sect in Protestantism can set up to be Philadelphia and point to all the rest as Laodicea, but that in all the Protestant sects are true believers, men and women, of the Philadelphia type, "Thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name," and in all of them the professing Laodicean class: "neither cold nor hot."

Do not modern conditions require modern rules for the church?

All the rules necessary for the church to the end of this age were given by the Spirit to the writers of the New Testament. The Bible, rightly interpreted, never grows out of date. It is the eternal Word of God, and its divine author when giving it to the world, knew our "modern conditions" perfectly—even foretold them.

What was the "rock" (Matt. 16:18) upon which Christ promised to build His Church, and what were the "keys" given to Peter?

Christ is the Rock, the "living stone," and believers are "living stones" (1 Pet. 2:4, 5) built upon Him as the Rock, and when Peter declared his belief in the revelation of Jesus as the Christ, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, as the sphere of Christian profession (Matt. 13), were given to him. On the day of Pentecost he used one key, opening the kingdom of heaven to the Jews, preaching Jesus as the rejected "Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36), and in the house of Cornelius (Acts 10:43) he used the second key, opening the kingdom to the Gentiles by preaching remission of sins through the name of Christ.

How can we account for the apparent failure of the church to perform the miracles enumerated in Mark 16:17, 18?

Briefly, three opinions are: (1) That the whole passage, Mark 16:9-19, is spurious. (See note to Revised Version.) (2) That the signs did follow for a time, until Christianity was so established that it constituted in itself a greater miracle. (3) That the passage is eschatalogical—an instruction to those Jewish witnesses who will preach "the gospel of the kingdom" during the great tribulation which runs its course after the Church is caught away, and before the Lord comes in glory. The latter seems to be the most plausible view, but it is a point upon which no one may dogmatize.

What does it mean to have "crucified the flesh" (Gal. 5:24)?

The crucifixion of the flesh in Galatians refers to the co-crucifixion of the believer with Christ. It is neither (1) an act of the believer subsequently to conversion; nor (2) an experience or attainment of the believer after conversion; nor (3) something which the believer is always doing. It is the truth stated explicitly in Romans 6:6. It is true of all who "are Christ's."

Does "gathered together in my name" (Matt. 18:20) apply to any local assembly of believers?

The passage would be better rendered, "gathered unto my name." It has no reference to assemblies of a certain kind or cult. It means no more than that where two or three believers are gathered unto His name—whether on the street, in a cave, in a cathedral, or in a meeting of "brethren," there He is in the midst. It excludes the idea of being gathered unto a human leader, or to a sect name, in any sense which deprives Christ of His alone place as the object of their gathering.

Dr. Bullinger, the Bible exegete, teaches the Israel-bride theory, based on Hosea, etc. How, then, can we say that the Church is the bride?

The New Testament speaks of the Church as a virgin espoused to one husband, which could never be said of an adulterous wife, divorced by reason of her adulteries. Israel is to be the restored and forgiven wife of Jehovah, and the Church the bride of the Lamb (John 3:29; Rev. 19:6-8), a different and subsequent relationship. A restored wife is neither a "virgin" nor a "bride." Israel, Jehovah's earthly wife (Hos. 2:23)—the Church, the Lamb's heavenly bride (Rev. 19:7). Israel's honor and distinction, even in this wifely relationship is to be on the earth through and following the millennium, when the new earth shall be established,—that of the Church,—in heaven. Remember that a King is to make a marriage for His *Son* (Matt. 22:2). Yes, Dr. Bullinger teaches the Israel-bride theory along with other error, forgetting that in *relationship* the Trinity acts individually.

We must remember that this figure of the bride is one of several to show the close, precious and vital relationship between Christ and believers of this age. Like the types, it cannot be dissected or analyzed as by a student at the dissecting table, else we would be confronted by endless problems; *i. e.,* how the millions of believers could make *one* bride, or *one* body. It is a mystical union, spiritually discerned, not materially. Genesis 2:23, 24 is the key to the mystery, used by the Spirit to unlock the doctrine in the New Testament, as aforesaid.

Does not Romans 7:4 teach that we are now married to Christ?

We must distinguish in Scripture between a figure or illustration, and a doctrine. No doctrine is based on a single passage. Much error and fanaticism arise from so doing. In Romans 7 Paul is illustrating the doctrine of law

and grace and the figure he uses is that of marriage. The contrast is between the fruitlessness of the law and fruit brought forth through Christ unto God. John, in Revelation 19:7, 9, reveals the time of the marriage of Christ to the Church, the bride.

Paul, in 2 Corinthians 11:2, reveals the Church's present relation to Christ,—that of betrothal.

CIVIC RIGHTEOUSNESS

Can you adjust for me the relation of the believer to the present world-system and politics?

There is such a thing as a mere mechanical separation from the world. We are to remember that a distinction must be made between the world of men—humanity, that God so loved as to give His only begotten Son to redeem, and the world system organized under Satan in its forms social, political and commercial. The individual believer is in the world, but not of it. It is a scene through which he is passing and his attitude toward it should be that of his Lord and of the apostles, as we gather that attitude from their writings.

With these general principles to guide one, it seems clear that the Christian could take little part, if any, in schemes for the improvement of the unregenerate world. The whole scene is one awaiting judgment; but as our Lord met throngs of people, He healed the sick and fed the hungry without asking whether they believed on Him or not. In other words, He did works of mercy. To apply all this to the case, for instance, of licensing saloons in a village, seems very simple. We love men because our heavenly Father and our Redeemer loved and loves them, and whatever we can do to benefit them or to keep them from harm, we should gladly do. It is this relation of love, rather than of citizenship or participation in the ambitions and rewards of political movements and reform movements that governs

the conduct of believers. If we could put up a fence that might prevent even a blind horse from falling into a pit, we should gladly do it. How much more should we lend a hand to put up a fence between the youth of a village and the open bar-room. In other words, our relation to everything is dominated by the law of love and of loving service. From time to time questions arise not easy of decision, but keeping the separate place in this attitude of loving helpfulness will, with prayer and the individual direction of the Spirit of God, enable us to keep in the pathway.

Is it not part of the mission of the church to correct the social evils of our day?

The church has but one mission, defined in Luke 24:47, 48; Matthew 28:18-20; Acts 1:8; and the church works most powerfully toward the solution of social problems not by turning reformer, but by preaching the gospel in the power of the Holy Spirit. When Christ was on earth all the social problems—slavery, intemperance, prostitution, unequal distribution of wealth, oppression of the weak by the strong—were at their worst. To cure them He put into the world one message—the gospel, one means —regeneration, one agency,—the Holy Spirit in the church. The best help a pastor can bring to the social problems of his community is to humble himself before God, forsake his sins, receive the filling with the Holy Spirit, and preach a pure gospel in tender love.

DEATH AND THE ETERNAL STATE

What is your opinion concerning that tract, "God's Love and Consuming Power"?

It is a dangerous presentation of the dangerous doctrine of conditional immortality, sometimes called "annihilationism." The sufficient answer to the contention that the lake of fire produced death in the sense of annihilation is found in Revelation 19:20 with Revelation 20:10. The beast and

false prophet are cast alive into the lake of fire, and after one thousand years they are still there. And, not only so, their doom is declared to be, not extinction of being, but "torment day and night forever and ever." Our space does not permit a demonstration (which could be easily made) that the biblical words *death, second death, perish, destroy,* never, in Old Testament or New, mean extinction of being.

Why is it that so little is said in Scripture concerning the future?

It is surprising how much we know about the eternal state and equally surprising how little we know. We know enough to give perfect certainty of blessedness to the saved, and of unspeakable woe to the lost; but not enough to permit much detail. Possibly we could not at present comprehend the eternal conditions. It is clear that there are to be "a new heaven and a new earth" in the place of the "first heaven and the first earth" (Rev. 21:1). This cannot be the millennial state for reasons which cannot be here stated, though doubtless there is a millennial aspect to Revelation 21:9-27. It is equally clear that the Church, "the new Jerusalem," descends "out of heaven" to, or over the earth, and that "the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them" (Rev. 21:2, 3, R. V.).

Can you give me any light on the subject of our holy dead?

The last clear word we have on the subject of the holy dead is in 2 Corinthians 5. Biblical revelation is progressive. We do not gain a clear view of a truth by jumbling together all the passages bearing upon it, but by marking carefully as we go through the Bible the progress or unfolding of doctrine. These things are to be noted in this latest view of the death of the Christian. First, that there is no unconscious sleep: "Absent from the body, present

with the Lord." There is no suggestion even of a conscious interval between the departure of soul and spirit from this earthly tabernacle, and the conscious and immediate presence of the Lord Himself.

But the other comforting and wonderful revelation is that the idea of a disembodied soul and spirit is, as concerns the Christian, unbiblical. Read carefully the first five verses of that chapter, and you will see that the present body is looked upon as a tabernacle or tent in which we are living, and that when we pass out from this tent-dwelling we are clothed upon with a "house from heaven." This is not the resurrection body, but it is a habitation in which we dwell and through which we may have communion with others there.

Then the word "present with the Lord" is really, "at home with the Lord," and this at once conveys the idea of fellowship. A home is not a solitary place, it is a place where the family live; and in the spiritual body, the house from heaven, the blessed dead inhabit that heaven-home. The question may arise, do they know what is transpiring here? There is not a single scripture that warrants us in supposing they do. But we may be sure they have such a sense of the safety of those in Jesus whom they have left behind, and of the shepherd care of the Lord over them, that they are not occupied with our sufferings and trials as we are. The falls and mishaps of our children seem very great to them, but only call out a comforting word or a caress from us. We know that they are not really so serious as they seem to be to the child. That is undoubtedly the Father's view, since He calls us "dear children" and "little children." And those in glory with Him must share that view. They are happy concerning us because they know our names are written in "the book of life" and that we shall soon meet them.

What is the meaning of "death" in Revelation 20:13, 14?

The grave. As to their spirits, the wicked dead are in hades; as to their bodies, in the grave and in the sea.

If the wicked are to be punished with "everlasting destruction" (2 Thess. 1:9), how can it be taught that the wicked suffer eternal torment?

"Everlasting destruction," in 2 Thessalonians 1:9, is to be construed as part of the whole passage. The "flaming fire" of verse 8 is the shekinah glory in which Christ will appear at the second advent, not the lake of fire, in which no one could suppose that the Lord Jesus is "revealed from heaven." Doubtless the final abode of "them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," is the lake of fire, but that is not in view here. The Lord is revealed in glory and the wicked are punished with everlasting "destruction from the presence of the Lord"—*i. e.*, with everlasting exclusion from His presence. The nature of their punishment is dealt with in other passages. That it is not "destruction" in the sense of annihilation is proved from these passages.

Do the Scriptures refer to literal fire in connection with the suffering of the wicked?

Men of God, of equal soundness in the faith, purity of life and power in service, are divided upon the question of the literal interpretation of the passages which speak of "fire" in connection with the suffering of the wicked. Our Lord speaks in the same sentence of an undying worm and of unquenched fire (Mark 9:44, 46, 48). Brethren who teach the figurative interpretation of these and like passages contend that physical fire could only inflict physical suffering, and that since even in the earth life mental or spiritual sufferings are inconceivably more dreadful than those of the

material body, it is to rob the penal passages of their terror to suppose them to refer to physical torment. The controversy (in so far as there is one) is not over what Scripture says, but what it means. It is not a controversy over the fact of unending suffering for sin—in which most biblical scholars agree—but only as to the nature of that suffering.

How does the scriptural doctrine of death compare with this subject as treated in much of the current literature?

It is impossible to take up fully the question of the biblical doctrine of death. It may be said, however, that very much in the current treatment of that subject in literature and from the pulpit is sentimental nonsense and worse. It is part of that neo-paganism which is filling religious thought with amazing rapidity. We are treated to "symphonies" of life and "foot-paths" to peace which might have been written by Epictetus and which have not one distinctively Christian element. Along with this pagan conception of life we might expect to find, and in fact do find, a corresponding pagan conception of death. Walt Whitman gives perfect expression to this neo-paganism when he calls death "the holiest minister of heaven," and exclaims:

> "Praise! praise! praise!
> For sure-entwining arms of cool-enfolding death."

Such talk goes far to justify suicide—as, indeed, the justification of suicide was its chief pagan use. If death is "sane and sacred," and "God's servant," then let us all flee to it from the "whips and scorns of time."

Needless to say that such sentimental fustian, perhaps too mawkish and silly to do much harm, is never found in Scripture concerning death. There, death is an "enemy"

and is to be cast into the lake of fire. The perfect fruition of Christ's redeeming work is to be the "destruction" of death. Death is the direct antipodes of Christ, who is "the life." Already, in the cross, death is defeated, and can now pass upon no believer, for no Christian ever "tastes death," but only "falls on sleep." In this sense death is ours already (1 Cor. 3:22), but is still an enemy, and the very last enemy to be destroyed (1 Cor. 15:26). It still remains true that "sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" (James 1:15); and that the three "groans" of Romans 8:22, 23, 26, ascend from creation, the Church and the Holy Spirit because of death.

Is there any scriptural warrant for believing that the spirits of our loved ones are round about us—"a cloud of witnesses" (Heb. 12:1)?

There is no clear biblical warrant for the thought that the Christian dead are watching us. That they are here, round about us, though unseen, is mere sentimentality or superstition. They are, as to spirit and soul "with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:8); and He is in heaven (Acts 1:11; 7:56; Rev. 3:21). It is, however, implied that they are made aware of the conversions of those whom they love (Luke 15:10). There is no reason why our Lord may not properly be asked, in submission of course to His will, to convey messages to our holy dead.

The "cloud of witnesses" of Hebrews 12:1 are not witnesses of us, but those just referred to in chapter 11, who have witnessed to Jesus. In the writer's glowing words they have been, as it were, evolved; it is as if we were "compassed" by them.

Why is the doctrine concerning life after death, as portrayed in the Old Testament, so different from its outlook in the New Testament?

The difference between the Old Testament doctrine con-

cerning the life after death and the doctrine of the New Testament is not one of contrast, but of development. It is the great law of Scripture that revelation proceeds by stages from the simple to the complex, from the rudimentary to the final. "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear."

Speaking broadly, the Old Testament horizon was the grave. Life was not conditioned upon eternal rewards, but temporal. The distinctive blessings promised to Israel were: "In the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, and the fruit of thy cattle," etc. Gradually light dawned upon the after-world, but it was broken and dim. With the coming of Christ all that was changed. He "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:10). Life and immortality were existent before Christ, but not clearly revealed.

Moreover, with the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, a fundamental change took place. Before His ascension the just and the unjust alike went to Sheol, or Hades. There the just abode in their own room or place of "paradise." Now paradise is in heaven itself, and the just at death go to be "at home with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:1-8; Eph. 4:8-10; 2 Cor. 12:1-4).

Where, now, are the souls of the redeemed?

The Scriptures teach that the souls of the redeemed pass at once into the presence of Christ at death (Luke 23:43; Acts 7:59; 2 Cor. 5:6-8; Phil. 1:23; Rev. 6:9-11).

Is there any difference between eternity and immortality?

A little study of the words "eternity" and "immortality" might be interesting and helpful. So much is missed from the original in the English translation of words. For instance, in 1 Timothy 6:16, 1 Corinthians 15:53, 54, we find the word "immortal" or "immortality" from the Greek

word *athanasia,* meaning deathlessness, or eternal existence. The word relates to the *body,* as the context shows, and means simply "this dying must put on undyingness." Mortal means "dying" (not dead). Now we are in a dying body—not dead—then we shall "put on" an undying body (1 Cor. 15). When God created man He breathed into him the breath of life—a wholly different thing from the life of beasts. Man only has immortality; the beasts have not. Again, in 2 Timothy 1:10, 1 Timothy 1:17, Romans 2:7, the same word is used, only in the Greek the word used is *aphtharsia,* meaning incorruption. So the same word, *immortality,* is used to express two different ideas,—time and quality. The word *eternal* has reference to duration only.

What is the difference between Sheol and Hades, paradise and heaven?

Sheol is the exact Old Testament equivalent of Hades in the New Testament. Both refer simply to the abode of the departed. Until our Lord's ascension the souls of all the dead went to Sheol, or Hades. But the condition of the righteous and of the unrighteous there differed widely. This is shown in Luke 16:19-26. Between the righteous and the unrighteous a great gulf was indeed fixed, and the former were comforted, the latter tormented. The Jews distinguished the place of the comforted in Hades as Abraham's bosom, or paradise. Our Lord adopted both expressions. When therefore, He promised the repentant thief a place with Him that day in paradise, He spoke of the place whither He Himself should go.

But when our Lord ascended into heaven, He took with Him those in paradise, and though paradise still exists as the abode of the blessed dead pending the resurrection, it is now in the third heaven, or the very place of our Lord's own presence. This appears from Ephesians 4:8, R.V., and 2 Corinthians 12:2-4. Christ ascending led a

multitude of captives; and Paul, caught up into the third heaven, found himself in paradise.

Hence it is now true that departing saints go, not into unconscious sleep with a mouldering body in the grave, but into paradise, which is in the third heaven, and so they are "present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:8).

How is the promise that believers shall never die, in John 11:26, to be understood?

It is not exemption from physical death. All of Christ's disciples died. The "last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (1 Cor. 15:26).

Will the joys of heaven, as well as the punishment of the lost, be alike for all?

No. There are degrees both in the punishment of the lost and in the rewards of the saved (1 Cor. 3:13-15; Luke 19:17-19; Rev. 22:12; Rev. 20:12; Luke 12:47, 48).

EVOLUTION

Upon what ground does a Christian evolutionist stand?

Those who call themselves Christian evolutionists claim that the hypothesis of the evolution of man does not contradict Scripture. To the writer it seems in flat contradiction. It is a matter that should trouble no one for the simple reason that we cannot fairly be called upon to disprove an unproved theory. It is not a question of one missing link, but of hundreds, perhaps thousands of missing links. Natural selection, and the differentiation of species, if established by competent proof, do not go one step toward proving the evolutionary origin of man. That all varieties of palms—and more than one thousand varieties are known—were derived from one original palm does not raise the smallest presumption that a palm tree ever becomes an apple tree. To this day not a scintilla of evi-

dence has been offered which tends to establish the pure hypothesis that higher species are developed out of lower.

But wholly apart from these considerations there is a consideration before which the hypothesis recoils. It is this: If the higher forms of life were evolved out of lower, then the processes must still be going on. We still have oysters, monkeys and men. If men were produced by evolution from oysters up through monkeys, there is no conceivable reason why men should not still be produced in that way—but no one pretends this.

Can you give me any help on the subject of evolution? My teachers all hold to it.

While evolution and rationalism have spread like wildfire through some of our schools, any one familiar with both sides of evolution knows that the whole thing is but a working hypothesis and that in most cases it doesn't work, and is losing ground continually. The late Dr. Virchow, the great pathologist and discoverer of the germ theory, was an active opponent of evolution. Dr. Gregory, editor of the "Homiletic Review," and in a position to know the facts, vouches for the statement that "It is a strange fact that no great scientific authority in Great Britain in exact science, science that reduces its conclusions to mathematical formulæ, has endorsed evolution." Sir J. William Dawson, the great geologist of Canada, utterly rejected it and says: "It is one of the strangest phenomena of humanity; it is utterly destitute of proof." Thomas Carlyle called it "the gospel of dirt." Ruskin said of it, "I have never yet heard one logical argument in its favor. I have heard and read many that are beneath contempt." Prof. Zockler writes: "It must be stated that the supremacy of this philosophy has not been such as was predicted by its defenders at the outset. A mere glance at the history of the theory during the four decades that it has been before the public shows that the beginning of the end is at hand."

Such utterances are now very common in the periodicals of Germany, it is said. It seems plain the reaction has commenced and that the pendulum that has swung so strongly in the direction of evolution, is now oscillating the other way. It required twenty years for evolution to reach us from abroad. Is it necessary for us to wait twenty years more to reverse our opinions? Why may we not pass upon facts for ourselves without awaiting the consensus of European scholarship, which is after all so subject to perplexing reversals?

The above statements have been quoted from a little book called "The Other Side of Evolution," by Alexander Patterson, D.D., and published by the Bible Institute Colportage Association of Chicago. It is a most interesting and valuable book—costing 60 cents. One could go on and on giving the strongest evidences on the other side.

If you are obliged to sit under rationalistic teachers, do so, but stand firmly by the Word—thousands upon thousands have had to defend it with their life blood—the enemy is growing more and more open in his attacks and more subtle in his methods, but God will soon vindicate Himself and then "we shall not be ashamed before him at his coming." We are truly in the last days and need to live very near the Lord (read 2 Pet. 2; 2 Tim. 3; 2 Tim. 4:1-4; Jude 3, 11).

FAITH

Is faith a direct and special gift of God, or a general gift?

This question has been a battleground of theologians. That all men have and exercise in the things of this life a faith (both of *assensus* and *fiducia*) which seems indistinguishable in essence from religious faith, seems confirmed by common observation. It would appear that the only real distinction between the general capacity of assent

and trust which all men have, and the *"fides specialis"* of the theologians, is in the object of faith. In Ephesians 2:8 grace and faith are included in "the gift of God."

It has long appeared to the writer that what is distinctively supernatural in any exercise of faith unto salvation is the act of the Spirit in making real to faith the person and work of Jesus Christ (Matt. 16:16, 17; John 6:39, 44, 45; 16:8-10).

THE HOLY SPIRIT

Is there any command in Scripture to seek the baptism of the Holy Spirit?

No. The believer is taught that he *is* baptized with the Spirit, and indwelt by the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:12, 13; Eph. 1:13; 1 Cor. 6:19; Rom. 8:9; Rom. 5:5). But he *is* commanded to be "filled with the Spirit" (Eph. 5:18).

It should be added that all who comply with the biblical conditions (Rom. 12:1; Eph. 4:30; 1 Thess. 5:19; John 7:37-39) are filled with the Spirit, though they may inaccurately speak of being "baptized." Christ, in whose hands the whole power in respect of the Spirit is lodged (Matt. 3:11; Acts 2:32, 33), responds to right moral conditions, even if the term used is incorrect; and it is better to be filled with the Spirit, and call that filling a baptism, than to have the terms right, and miss the blessing. The best way of all, is to have the blessing and to call it by the right word.

If "every believing sinner has, in the moment of his trust in Christ, been baptized by one Spirit into one body," had not the disciples of our Lord received the Spirit before the day of Pentecost?

The statement quoted applies to believers at and after the giving of the gospel to the Gentiles (Acts 10:44-46). The personal disciples of our Lord were not baptized with the Spirit before Pentecost because "he was not yet given"

(John 7:39). The twelve, however, had received the indwelling Spirit on the evening of Christ's resurrection day (John 20:22).

Up to the evening of Christ's resurrection the disciples had the Spirit with them, but not in them (John 14:17). On that evening He indwelt them (John 20:22). On the day of Pentecost He baptized them into one body and filled them (Acts 2:1-4; 1 Cor. 12:12, 13). After Pentecost, so long as the gospel was offered to Jews and Jewish proselytes only, that is, from Acts 2 to Acts 9, inclusive, the Holy Spirit was not given but by the mediation of the apostles through prayer (Acts 8:15, 17) and the laying on of hands. But when Peter in the household of Cornelius opened the door to the Gentiles, "the Holy Ghost fell on them," without interval, prayer, the laying on of hands or any other means. It was the answer to believing hearing of the Word. Since that day the Spirit indwells every believer (1 Cor. 6:19; Rom. 8:9, etc.) and baptizes every believer into the one body (1 Cor. 12:12, 13).

It should be observed, however, that not all believers are filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18); and that while no condition but faith in Jesus Christ is required for receiving the indwelling and baptizing, there are conditions for receiving the filling.

Almost hopeless confusion has been created in the minds of believers by the modern insistence upon "seeking the baptism" with the Spirit. There is not a line of Scripture for it. Our Lord's words in Luke 11:13 could not have referred to the baptism with the Spirit because it was impossible for the Spirit to so come until Christ had departed from the earth (John 16:7; Acts 2:33); and when Christ was exalted to the right hand of the Father He did, according to His promise, send the Spirit. For that coming of the Spirit the disciples were not taught to "seek" but only to "tarry." "Ye shall be baptized," etc. In all the fourteen

epistles of Paul there is not one exhortation to "seek the baptism with the Spirit." On the contrary, he says, "we all" *have* been baptized by one Spirit into one body. But he does exhort us to be filled with the Spirit, which is quite a different thing. The baptism unites to the body and imparts gift; the filling gives power. On the day of Pentecost the disciples were both baptized and filled. The great need of God's people today is to be filled with the Spirit.

If all believers are born of the Spirit, what is meant by being "filled with the Spirit"?

The Scriptures distinguish between having the Spirit and being filled with the Spirit (compare Eph. 1:13; 4:30 with Eph. 5:18). All believers are indwelt by the Spirit, and by Him baptized into Christ (1 Cor. 6:19; Rom. 8:9; Eph. 1:13; 1 Cor. 12:12, 13, etc.), but alas! all are not filled with the Spirit. The point of urgency lies just there. All may be so filled. The conditions are of two kinds, negative and positive. We cannot be filled while allowing things which grieve or quench the Spirit (Eph. 4:30-32; 1 Thess. 5:19). This involves consecration in the sense of Romans 6:16-19; 12:1.

The positive conditions are stated by our Lord in John 7:37-39, where the central words are "thirst," "come," "drink." The method is the prayer which claims and the faith which takes. Thousands pray all their life for the Spirit but ignore (1) that they already have Him, and (2) that His fullness must be received by a definite act of faith.

Does not "quench not the Spirit" imply that we may lose Him?

The thought is not putting the Spirit out of His temple the believer, but quenching His fire, His energizing power. If we could "put out," drive away the Holy Spirit, then our power would be greater than His, since Jesus sent Him

to abide with us "forever" (John 14:16); and by the same blessed Person we are "sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. 1:13, 14; 4:30).

What is blasphemy against the Holy Ghost?

See Matthew 12:31. The context, especially verse 24, shows the nature of that sin. A Christian could not commit this sin, (1) because of the new nature in him, and (2) because if he did, there would be no salvation for him, and this, according to Scripture (John 10:29; 3:16; etc.) could not be possible for any believer.

Why does Ephesians command believers to "be filled with the Spirit" in 5:18, when already believers have been told that they are "sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise" in 1:13?

Because the sealing and the filling are two different operations of the Spirit. The distinctions are (1) that all are sealed, not all are filled. (2) That while the sealing is "unto the day of redemption"—that is final and once for all, the filling must be renewed so often as the Spirit has been grieved or quenched. Normally, the sealing and the filling are synchronous (Acts 2:1-4).

That the filling with the Spirit marks an advance upon the sealing is clear in Ephesians from the differences between the exhortations which are addressed on the one hand to the sealed, on the other hand to those to be filled. (Compare Eph. 4:17-32 with Eph. 5:19-33.) The first exhortations relate to common morality—"put away lying"; "let him that stole steal no more, but let him labor, working with his hands." Bitterness, wrath, etc., are to be put away. The second class of exhortations rises to the highest spheres of victorious living. It is equal error to deny the universality of the sealing among believers, or to deny the need of the filling as a blessed and continuously renewed

experience. The sealing has to do with standing before God; the filling with the state of soul.

What distinction is to be made between regeneration and the baptism of the Holy Spirit? Also between the baptism and the filling?

Regeneration is that operation of the Holy Spirit by which the believer on the Lord Jesus Christ is, in the moment of his act of trust, "born anew" (John 3:3, R.V.), thus receiving the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4), and the life of the risen Christ (1 John 5:12; Col. 3:4).

The baptism with the Holy Spirit is that operation of the Spirit by which the believer is baptized into the body of Christ. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:12, 13).

So long as the gospel was being preached, after Pentecost, to Jews only (Acts 2-9) an interval elapsed between regeneration and the baptism; but from the opening of the door to the Gentiles, in the house of Cornelius (Acts 10), the baptism follows immediately the believer's regeneration. The act of trust, regeneration and baptism into Christ are practically simultaneous, though following the above order.

The confusion which exists in some minds concerning these various operations of the Spirit arises from making the baptism with the Spirit and the filling with the Spirit identical. All believers are baptized and sealed with the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:7, 11, 12, 13, 18; Eph. 1:13, etc.), but not all believers are filled with the Spirit (cf. Eph. 1:13 with Eph. 5:18); and power depends upon the state of being filled with the Spirit. The filling is an experience subsequent to faith, regeneration and Spirit baptism. Christ said

that power should follow the baptism (Acts 1:8) and accordingly, in the account of Pentecost (Acts 2) we find first the baptism in verse 3 and then (verse 4) "they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak," etc. Here the filling followed immediately upon the baptism. Evidently this had not been so at Ephesus (Eph. 1:13 with 5:18), nor is it usually so now. It is not the fact of having been baptized with the Spirit, but the state of being filled with the Spirit which gives power. There is too much discussion of Spirit-baptism, too little of Spirit-filling.

Luke 11:13 was an instruction suited to the then condition of Jesus' disciples. Not one of them (unless Mary of Bethany was an exception) had faith to comply with the instruction. So our Lord, in John 14:16, said: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter," etc. Pentecost was in answer to the prayer of Christ. It is a pure assumption that the disciples between the ascension of Christ and the day of Pentecost were praying for the Spirit. They had an absolutely unconditional promise of the Spirit.

Finally, consider this immensely significant fact that not once in the Epistles is the believer urged to "seek" the baptism with the Spirit. He is told that he has the Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19; Rom. 8:9, 13; Eph. 1:13; 4:30, etc.), but is commanded to be filled with Him.

Is it necessary to be conscious of a definite change in order to be filled with the Spirit?

Many Spirit-filled believers have never been conscious of any definite change, nor could put any date upon this experience, which is, nevertheless, an experience subsequent to conversion in most cases. If the evidences—the fruit of the Spirit,—are manifest in a life, that is proof enough. The degree in which the evidences are manifested deter-

mines the measure of the filling. Of course, there is often leakage, so to speak, unless one is watchful and prayerful, and the need to "keep being filled" (Eph. 5:18) is an imperative command implying a continual necessity.

Who is "he who now letteth" in 2 Thessalonians 2:7?

"He who now letteth," or literally, "hindereth," is the Holy Spirit, who restrains the outbreaking of lawlessness in the world "until he be taken out of the way," with the translation of the Church, of which the Holy Spirit is the bond of unity. While He will leave the earth with the Church, He will return upon individuals as in previous dispensations, *i. e.*, Psalm 51:12; Micah 3:8; Judges 3:10; so that conversion work will go right on during the tribulation, as now, in individuals though with greater hindrances through Satanic agencies.

INSPIRATION

Would there be any violation of the truth to say that parts of the Scriptures were verbally inspired and not all?

To say that some of the Scriptures were verbally inspired and some not, would be to deny the testimony of Scripture to itself. The writers of Scripture "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1:21). This does not imply automatic dictation, but such a control, by the Spirit, of the vocabulary of the different writers as to exclude from their writings everything not intended by the Spirit to go into them, and also such a use of the vocabulary of the writers as would give the full and complete thought in the Spirit's mind. This leaves room for the individuality of the writers, so apparent, but not for the modern contention that only parts of the Scripture are inspired. This notion leaves each individual free to reject as uninspired whatever in the divine Word happens to be

irksome to obey or unwelcome to believe. The teachings of God never were nor ever will be acceptable to the natural heart and will (1 Cor. 2:14; Rom. 8:7). We need, these days more than ever, to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3, R.V.).

If the Bible was inspired, must we not also believe that the present arrangement of the books was inspired also?

Our arrangement of the books of the Bible differs from the Jewish order, which was Christ's Bible, and this again from the order of the Septuagint, which was the Apostles' Bible, therefore it would be exceedingly difficult to show that the order of the books which our present-day Bibles follow is of divine authority. Reverence for the Scriptures as verbally inspired in the original documents is one thing. To believe that the divine Providence so watches over Scripture as to make a wrong arrangement of the books impossible is not only another thing, but is flatly contradicted by the history of the canon. The one position is that of faith, the other of superstition. The one makes of the words God's infallible revelation to man; the other makes a fetich of the mechanical arrangement of the books.

In what way does the term, "Book of Moses," prove the inspiration of the Pentateuch?

The first five books of the Bible were accepted by the Jewish people as the "Book of Moses" and was not disputed by them. If that book were a mixture of facts and fables, as the Son of God Christ would know it and would have corrected the Jewish idea. "If it were not so, I would have told you." If the Word of the Lord is "tried" (2 Sam. 22:31) and "every word of God is pure" (Prov. 30:5), He never would have allowed it to pass down through the centuries adulterated with the uninspired thoughts of men,

for then it would not have been a "tried," nor a very "pure" Word.

How far does verbal inspiration go?

What inspiration undertakes to do in reporting the words of men is to report them correctly. Whether those words, thus correctly reported, are words which God inspired the man to utter, or his own words, must be decided by: (1) what is said in Scripture concerning them; (2) by their agreement with revealed truth on that subject. For instance, Satan, in Genesis 3:4, said, "Ye shall not surely die." Inspiration correctly reports Satan, but the words were Satan's lie, not God's truth. In the case of Zophar, Bildad and Eliphaz (Job 42:7), Scripture expressly declares, "Ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath." What Job said, then, is "right," or inspired truth; what the three friends said is correctly reported and so inspired, but is not the thing that is "right," therefore not inspired truth.

Verbal inspiration is not claimed for the various translations of the Bible, but only for the original manuscripts. Of course the nearer the translators come in their interpretations to the original Greek and Hebrew meanings, the clearer is the inspired Word translated.

Do not holy men write now under inspiration just as truly as when the Bible was written?

No, not in the sense in which that word is applied to the Holy Scriptures. The proof of this is found in the contrasts between the best of their writings and the Scriptures.

Not one of Paul's later epistles contradicts or modifies a single statement of one of his earlier epistles. It is commonly said by adversaries of plenary inspiration that in 2 Thessalonians 2 Paul contradicted the idea taught in 1 Thessalonians 4 that Christ might come at any time for His Church. It is not true. In the earlier epistle the apostle

is speaking of the coming of Christ for His Church, in the latter of His subsequent glorious appearing after the apostasy and the manifestation of the man of sin.

The writings of Paul and the other apostles have exactly the same authority that the words of Christ have, that is, divine authority. Christ said that He would leave an incomplete revelation (John 16:12). He said that this revelation would be completed after the Holy Spirit came (John 16:13). It is impossible to think of anything beyond "all" truth. The Apostle Paul (1 Cor. 2:9-13) describes the whole process of revelation by inspiration in the following steps: (1) The things which form the subject of revelation are not discoverable by natural powers, (2:9); (2) God has revealed them by His Spirit to "us" the apostles (2:10). Those revealed things the writers utter "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." The promise of Christ (John 16:13) is thus fulfilled. Paul's "experience," "broader view," etc., have nothing to do with his writings. They are Spirit-revealed, Spirit-given words. They have therefore the same divine authority as the words of Christ Himself.

The commands of holy men now have absolutely no authority, for they are not revelations, nor are they communicated in Spirit-taught words. Nor, needless to say, does any really holy man so claim.

With all the modern teaching concerning the historical portions of the Old Testament, is a minister at liberty to use his own judgment in allegorizing?

Every minister of Jesus Christ is under obligation to preserve toward the Old Testament precisely the attitude of Jesus Christ. What the Old Testament was to Jesus Christ is easy of ascertainment. In one afternoon one may go through the Gospels and select every reference of our Lord to the Scriptures. From those passages may be drawn Christ's doctrine of the Old Testament. That He

received it all as the very Word of God is indisputable to any one trained in the law of evidence. He obeyed it Himself; He appealed to it as containing His doctrine, and as testifying of Him. He never criticized it, never intimated that it was in any sense unworthy of credence. Instead of saying that the accounts of the flood, of Jonah, of Lot's wife, were myths or allegories, He went, as one may say, out of His way to affirm the historicity of those events.

ISRAEL AND THE CHURCH

Can the Church claim Old Testament promises or only New Testament ones?

A literal promise to Israel can be given a spiritual signification and applied, not to the Church, but to saints—to Christians. The Church is a corporate thing—the body of Christ, composed of all believers. These believers are separately in union with Christ as individuals, and from any part of the Scriptures may be drawn spiritual analogies and lessons of inestimable value to Christians in this Church age. The distinction between Israel and the Church is between a nation and the body of Christ. Romans 15:4 and 2 Timothy 3:16 apply here. It is well to remember that all Scripture was written for us, but all Scripture was not written to us. It is our Bible from beginning to end, and frequently a prophecy addressed to Israel and for Israel is such a disclosure of the mind and nature of the unchanging God that we who belong to a different order may nevertheless learn from it vitally important lessons concerning our Father's way of looking at things and what manner of being He really is.

Do not such Old Testament scriptures as Isaiah 55 show that the Church was in the mind of the prophets?

Isaiah 55 is a Messianic prophecy and it foretells the extension of Messianic blessing and salvation to other nations than Israel. This phase of prophecy is taken up

in the 9th, 10th and 11th chapters of Romans. The Old Testament abundantly testifies that through Messiah salvation should come to the Gentiles, but Paul tells us that the Church was a mystery, hidden (Eph. 3:1-11). A salvation extending to all people who believe, without reference to race distinction is a Messianic promise, but the Church is not a mere mass of saved individuals, but is an organic unity formed by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, uniting believers to the risen Christ in glory (1 Cor. 12:12, 13). This failure to distinguish between the individual Jew or Christian, and Israel the nation, and the saved of this dispensation, as forming the Church brings confusion to many minds.

Since Paul speaks of the Church as the Israel of God, may we not apply Old Testament texts to believers of this age?

1. It is decidedly erroneous to speak of the Church as the Israel of God. That expression occurs, as you know, in Galatians 6:16, and the use of the conjunction shows that the apostle is thinking of categories or divisions; there is peace to those who walk according to this rule—that is, the Christian,—and peace invoked also upon the Israel of God. The Apostle Paul never lost his kinsmen according to the flesh out of his solicitude.

2. Is there not a spiritual Israel? Certainly. That is the explicit teaching of Romans 9. There is an Israel within Israel, just as in this day there is a true Church within that body of profession that constitutes the visible church.

3. As to the use of Old Testament texts in preaching to the men of this day,—there is nothing in the distinctions between Israel and the Church to forbid such use of Old Testament texts, provided they are used to illustrate and enforce the principles upon which God is acting toward the world. In a word, the error to be avoided is the theological

notion that Israel has been forever set aside, and the Church put in the place of Israel as inheriting Israel's promises.

How could Israel accept Christ if blindness was sent upon them (2 Cor. 3:14)?

Blindness was not sent until Israel had finally rejected the light, which, persistently rejected, always produces blindness. Both are from God, the one in mercy, the other in judgment. The laws of nature explain the laws of God. So it was with Pharaoh. We, as free agents may harden our hearts against God—He simply seals our choice. What a tremendous responsibility is wrapped up in the marvelous endowment of a free moral agency! We choose,—God seals.

Who were "the twelve tribes scattered abroad" to whom Peter addressed his epistle?

By "the twelve tribes scattered abroad" we are to understand, not Jews, but Christian Jews of the Dispersion. The twelve tribes, simply as Jews would have no "elders of the church" to call for. So the admonitions and promises of James are for all the members of the Church, though especially written to Jewish believers (as, also, was Hebrews) for whom James felt a special solicitude and pastoral responsibility. It was probably the first epistle written to Christians, and is therefore most elementary in doctrine, written before the Pauline Epistles.

Matthew is peculiarly the gospel for Israel, but, as flowing from the death of Christ, a gospel for the whole world. When you come to study the book of Matthew distinguish between that in it which relates to the future kingdom (which then being offered, was rejected and therefore set aside for the time being) and to the Church; *e. g.*, the Sermon on the Mount will be the law of the kingdom age, but its moral applications are in force today, just as all

that is spiritual in the Old Testament, though written in an age of law and earthly promises, may be appropriated by us as belonging to the heavenly seed of Abraham.

Since Israel's rejection of Christ was foretold, how would it have been possible for them to recognize in Him the Messiah?

1. Had Israel accepted all of the prophecies concerning Christ they would have had no difficulty in recognizing Him as the promised Messiah. Because of their rejection, foreseen by the prophets, Christ's second coming became necessary, Israel being set aside in the interregnum and the Gentiles brought in (Rom. 11). We must constantly bear in mind that the foreseeing of an event by the prophets in no way affected the event.

2. It was not because the prophets foretold Christ's rejection by Israel, but because of Israel's own sin and blindness of heart that they rejected and crucified Him. The prophecies concerning Christ, His own spotless life, His miracles and His testimony, all should have been sufficient evidence for those who knew the Scriptures and the God of the Scriptures as Israel claimed to, but did not (see John 8:19, 42-59). They were far from ready, spiritually, for the establishment of the kingdom, which must be based on spiritual principles, the Sermon on the Mount forming the ethical constitution of the kingdom. How far short of this Israel fell we can readily see in the Gospels. Had Israel been spiritually ready, the development of the kingdom into its glorious character would have been the natural result.

The Jews were justified in expecting a glorious and visible kingdom, but, taught by the same prophets, they should have expected Isaiah 7:14; 53, also to be fulfilled. Our Lord took up that very question with the Emmaus disciples. "Ought not the Christ to have suffered?" etc. (Luke 24:26), according to the Scriptures.

What is the "Israel of God" in Galatians 6:16?

In this passage the heart of the apostle turns for a moment from the Church, in which believing Jews and believing Gentiles alike become "new creatures," to God's ancient people, the Jews, who are always "the Israel of God." It may be added that elsewhere (Rom. 9:10) Paul distinguishes between the true spiritual Israel and the Israel made up of the mere literal descendants of Jacob. All Jews belong to the latter; believing Jews only to the former (Rom. 2:28, 29; Rom. 9:6-8).

THE JUDGMENTS

Is it self that judges the sinner?

No, not self, but the law of God that judges the sinner. The judgment of self refers to believers only, who are no longer under law as a rule of life, but under the Spirit (see Rom. 8; Gal. 2 and 3). The Spirit convicts the believer of sin,—the law convicts the unbeliever, although conviction of the special sin of unbelief in Christ is produced in the sinner by the Spirit (John 16:8, 9). When the believer is convicted, his remedy is self-judgment and confession, followed by cleansing, which is God's act (1 Cor. 11:31, 32; 2 Cor. 5:10, 11; 1 John 1:9, 10). When the sinner is convicted, his remedy is the blood of Jesus.

How can nations be judged, as indicated in Matthew 25?

The judgment of the nations of which Matthew 25:31-46 is the prophecy, is shown by the detail of that passage to be a judgment of the persons composing the nations. Their doom is final. The force of the word "nations" is to limit the scope of the judgment to the nations within the sphere of the ancient Roman empire, *i. e.*, Gentiles. In the prophetic word "nations" are distinguished from "kindreds, people, tribes and tongues." The people of Africa, for ex-

ample, are not a "nation." Nations are only found within the limits of the ancient Roman Empire. To take another example, Russia is not a nation. Politically, Russia is a power, otherwise Russia is a congeries of non-homogeneous tribes, peoples and tongues.

The "nations" are judged according to works, for all judgment is according to works. Even the believer will be judged—as will also the unbeliever—according to works (1 Cor. 3:11-15; Rev. 20:12). But "works" are not "sins." The believer's sins are blotted out.

Upon what ground are the nations to be judged at the second coming of our Lord?

The basis of that judgment is treatment accorded the Jewish remnant; that is, the remnant of believing Jews who will have turned to Christ after the removal of the Church. This body of believers will be the evangelists of the great tribulation. They will preach again the gospel of the kingdom. Individuals among the nations will be judged according to their treatment of these messengers of the kingdom, for that treatment, good or bad, will be an expression of faith or of unbelief and hatred toward the King Himself.

Is the judgment of Acts 17:31 the beginning of "the day of the Lord," or is the judgment of the nations described in Matthew 25?

"The day" of Acts 17:31 is "the day of the Lord," which begins with the rapture of the Church and ends with the judgment of the great white throne. It is a long "day" during which are many judgments, as the seal, trumpet, and vial judgments of the Apocalypse; the destruction of Antichrist, followed by the judgment of the nations at the glorious appearing of the Lord; the destruction of Satan's army at the end of the thousand years, and the

final judgment of "the wicked dead" before the great white throne.

Are Christians to be judged at the great white throne for their forgiven sins?

No; not only are Christians not to be judged for forgiven sins (and that means all their sins), but it is impossible even to bring a charge against them before God (Rom. 8:33, 34). The notion that all humanity will be brought into judgment before the great white throne is simply a theological invention, without a syllable of Scripture support. The saved have been raised from the dead one thousand years before the judgment of the great white throne and have been reigning with Christ (Rev. 20:5, 6). It is only "the dead" who come into that judgment. The works of the Christian, must, however, pass the scrutiny of the Lord at His coming (1 Cor. 3:11-15; 4:5; Rev. 22:12). (The whole subject is made clear in the author's "Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth," paper, 15 cents; cloth, 30 cents.)

KINGDOM TRUTH

If the kingdom age is to last one thousand years, why is it so often spoken of in the prophecies as lasting "forever"?

As to the duration of the kingdom—(forever), it should be noted that the kingdom passes through many phases. It exists at the present time in the "mystery" form of Matthew 13. Upon the return of the King, it will be set up in the form predicted by the prophets, of whose testimony Isaiah 11 is an illustration. The continuance of that form of the kingdom is fixed at 1,000 years, according to the 20th chapter of Revelation, and that phase of the kingdom culminates in the delivery of the kingdom to God, even the Father, according to 1 Corinthians 15:24, at which time

it takes on its eternal form or phase. Bear in mind also that this phase of the kingdom is to be continued in the new heavens and the new earth.

In Matthew 5:19 we are told that whoever breaks one of the commandments and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven. How do you reconcile this with the modern teaching that Christians are not under the law?

You quote our Lord's words incorrectly. Not "one of the commandments," but, "one of *these* commandments," *i. e.*, in the Sermon on the Mount.

The Sermon on the Mount is kingdom, not church, truth. Christ was preaching the kingdom as "at hand" to Israel, and the great sermon has been called "the constitution of the kingdom of heaven." That kingdom was rejected by the Jews, but will be set up when our Lord returns (Acts 15:16). Then the sermon will be in force as legislation. It will be true that, "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven." There is, of course, a moral application to the Church of the truth enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount.

Explain what is meant by the phrase, "the development of the kingdom."

The kingdom of heaven is Messiah's kingdom, and has to do with the re-establishment of the divine authority in the earth. It exists in Scripture in five aspects: (1) Foretold in the Davidic covenant (2 Sam. 7: 8-16; Psa. 89:3, 4, 20, 37; Isa. 11:1-16; Jer. 23:3-8; Ezek. 34:22-26; 37:21-25; Luke 1:30-33); (2) "At hand" (Matt. 3:1-3; 4:17; 10:5-7); (3) Rejected (Matt. 12:20-26; John 19:14-16); (4) In "mystery" (Matt. 13:1-51). This is the present form of the kingdom of heaven. It is, briefly, a mixed condition of good and evil within the kingdom—

wheat and tares grow together; good fish and bad are taken in the same net. That this is not the final state is clearly stated. It is only "until the harvest," and the harvest is "the end of the age" (not "world"). "Then the righteous shall shine forth as the sun" (Matt. 13:43), for then begins the fifth form of the kingdom of heaven, namely, the kingdom in glory. The return of the King introduces this phase of the kingdom of heaven (Luke 19:12-19; Acts 15:14-17, etc.). It should be remembered that it is the glory form which the prophets saw and described. The mystery form of Matthew 13 was not revealed to them (Matt. 13:17). The glory form lasts until "all things are subdued unto" the King (Christ), when the distinctive "kingdom of heaven" is merged in the kingdom of God, "that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15:24-28).

Will there be sin during the millennium, and will human life run about the same length as now?

There will be death during the millennium (Isa. 65:20) but as the last clause indicates, human life will be prolonged in general. Though the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God, etc., and righteousness will prevail, sin and death are not eliminated, as the verse previously quoted shows. Revelation 20 proves that the evil heart will still be in man, and those who remain in rebellion against God, Satan will gather to battle against the holy city, verses 7-15. The regenerate will serve Christ from the heart,—the unregenerate because the rule of Christ will compel instant obedience and subjection, though it may be only outwardly.

Give an illustration of the statement, "Figures are often found in the prophecies, but the figure invariably has a literal fulfillment."

It would be, perhaps, more accurate to say, the thing figured, or the meaning hidden in the figure, has a literal

fulfilment. For instance, in the 37th chapter of Ezekiel the prophet sees a vision of a valley full of dry bones. Then as he views the bones, he sees them covered with flesh and skin; and they stand up, an exceeding great army. This is the figure. Verses 11-14 explain the figure. These bones are the whole house of Israel, and the meaning of the new life given to the bones is explained to be a future restoration of Israel to their own land—the land of Palestine. The thing figured by the vision of the valley of dry bones will be literally fulfilled. Israel will be literally brought back to her own land, according to verses 11-14. Then follows the figure of the two sticks that become one stick in the hand of the prophet. That is explained to mean a future reunion of the ten tribe kingdom with Judah and Benjamin. There shall no more be two nations, but one nation, like the one stick made out of the two sticks, and that will be literally fulfilled. In other words, we have but to ascertain the meaning of the figure, and we have then something that in the plan of God will be fulfilled literally.

In view of the fact that Israel as a kingdom ceased some hundreds of years before Christ came, please explain Genesis 49:10—"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come."

We are always to bear in mind concerning Israel the fact that its constitution was essentially religious, not civil. It was a theocracy, not a monarchy nor a democracy. The unseen God was the king, but the government of the people religiously, as established in the monarchy legislation, did continue until the coming of Messiah. The Jewish people, after the Babylonian captivity, were always under the political overlordship of some Gentile power, but always maintained their theocratic rule in religious matters. This continued until the destruction of the temple and the final dispersion of Israel in A. D. 70. At that

time, Messiah having come, the sceptre and all religious and political authority over Israel was vested in Him.

If the kingdom of heaven is the sphere of profession, and the kingdom of God is spiritual, why is the parable of the Mustard Seed used of both?

The explanation lies in the fact that the kingdom of God in this age and the kingdom of heaven have this in common, that from an insignificant beginning they had a rapid growth. On the day of Pentecost, for example, the first day when the gospel was preached in the power of the Holy Spirit, three thousand were added to the Church; that is, three thousand really and truly believed and were therefore brought into the kingdom of God. This would correspond with the rapid growth of the mustard tree from the smallest of seeds, but in all the detail of its meaning, the parable of the Mustard Seed could not be interpreted of the kingdom of God. The central thought in both cases of this parable is that stated,—the rapid growth from a small beginning. As applied to the kingdom of heaven, certain details are added in Matthew.

What is "the kingdom of heaven" in Matthew 25, and whom do the "foolish virgins" represent?

The phrase, "kingdom of heaven," in Matthew 25 means the phase or form of the kingdom described in Matthew 13, as the "mystery" form of the kingdom, extending from the rejection of the King at His first advent to "the harvest" at His second coming in glory. The chief characteristic of the mystery form of the kingdom is that tares and wheat, believers and professors, grow together until the harvest; the net takes good fish and bad. In other words, the kingdom of heaven during this dispensation is the sphere of profession. Hence, in Matthew, from chapter 13 to the end, the parables take account of that fact, and are filled with warnings for professors. That the

Lord could be imagined as denying one of His own, or casting one of His blood-washed ones into outer darkness, is most solemn warning of the danger of making Scripture fit theories.

In this parable of the Virgins, all alike have lamps, but the foolish virgins "took no oil," and the Lord said, "I know you not." These two facts fix the status of the foolish virgins. Oil is the symbol of the Holy Spirit (see Rom. 8:9). Besides, the Lord could not say to any believer, "I know you not," however unspiritual that believer might be.

What is the "kingdom of God" in contrast to the "kingdom of heaven"?

The kingdom of God is, briefly, all moral intelligences in affectionate submission to the will of God. It includes "an innumerable company of angels," "the general assembly and church of the first-born," and "the spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. 12:22, 23)—that is, all the saved of past and future dispensations though not included in the distinctive body, the Church. For this reason all that is real in the mystery form of the kingdom of heaven is in the kingdom of God (Matt. 13:38, 48). In other words, the true believer of this age who is in the Church which is Christ's body, is one of the "children of the kingdom" in the mystery form of the kingdom of heaven, and is also in the kingdom of God, since all true believers belong to that kingdom. For this reason many parables and other kingdom sayings are used in Matthew of the kingdom of heaven, in Luke of the kingdom of God. If an American traveling abroad registers in one city as a resident of the United States, and in another city as a resident of Wisconsin, there is no contradiction, because Wisconsin is in the United States. But so is Louisiana in the United States, and yet there are many differences of climate, customs and laws between Louisiana and Wisconsin. The

kingdom of God, then, is the large inclusive term; the kingdom of heaven and "the Church" are (in so far as real faith is exercised) within the kingdom of God, but lesser, and having distinctions between each other.

In what sense was the kingdom of heaven suffering violence as stated in Matthew 11:12?

Various interpretations of Matthew 11:12 ("And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force") are suggested. Some hold it to mean that men of determined will, of strong or "violent" natures, were pressing into the kingdom despite all obstacles; that, in other words, the kingdom was attracting the strong and resolute. This is absurd. As usual, the context gives the interpretation, —"To what shall I liken this generation," etc. The meaning obviously is that the kingdom in its then weakness was *suffering* violence. John the Baptist was in prison, and the King Himself was soon to be slain and His disciples scattered.

What is the glory referred to in Haggai 2:7?

However translated, it refers to millennial glory. The comfort for the old men was the comfort of the man of faith who was thus assured that God had not forsaken Israel, but was yet to re-establish His temple in more than the former glory. They might not live to see it, but the assurance would be a comfort and stay to them.

What does "Gog and Magog" in Revelation mean?

The reference to "Gog and Magog" in Revelation 20:8 seems to be conclusive that not the nations of Europe as a whole, but Russia, is in view in the "Gog and Magog" prophecies.

How can passages which refer to the regathering of Israel be distinguished from those which refer to the millennial age?

As the regathering of Israel into their own land is contemporaneous with the setting up of the millennial kingdom, therefore we do not need to distinguish passages which relate to the regathering from those which relate to the millennium. The regathering is an incident of the millennium—belongs to the prophetic foreview of the millennium.

What will be Israel's place in the future?

Israel's distinction, glory and destiny will always be earthly. They will also be a spiritual people, Jehovah's own possession. There is no division, however, between the saved Jew and the saved Gentile of this dispensation, both being in the Church. But after the Church is complete, at the end of this dispensation, there will of necessity be a division. The "holy Jerusalem" of Revelation 21 is the "bride, the Lamb's wife," for whom is the "new heaven," while the "new earth" will be for Israel, the tabernacle of God to be with them, and "God himself shall be with them and be their God." The distinctive New Testament spiritual and heavenly blessings are for the Church; those blessings of and on the earth, for Israel. Jehovah, the supreme God of both, reigning in person over the earth with Israel, and at the same time, in heaven with the Church (Ezek. 37:25-28; Ezek. 43:7, 9; Mic. 4:7; Jer. 17:25; Hos. 2:16-21; Joel 3:20; Ezek. 36:28; Rev. 21:3, 4).

What is the meaning of "Ten men shall take hold of the skirt of a Jew," in Zechariah 8:23?

Verse 23 undoubtedly refers to the millennium, as such a condition of affairs has never yet been realized. "Ten men" is simply a figurative proportion of Gentiles as compared with Israelites, who will seek the Lord during the

millennium. Chapter 8:3-8 refers to the final restoration, when truth and righteousness shall prevail. These elements never have prevailed on this earth, with God "dwelling in the midst." A careful comparison of the prophecies with history will usually enable us to place the prophecies where they belong.

If righteousness is to cover the earth during the kingdom age, where will Satan find the army spoken of in Revelation 20:7-9?

The army of Satan gathered at the end of the thousand years will of course be descendants born during the thousand years of those who are spared among the nations to enter the kingdom. The fact that the kingdom age begins with a purgation of the nations does not imply that the descendants of those who are saved and enter the kingdom will all be Christians. Some of the wickedest men in the world today are the sons of godly parents. So it will be during the tribulation.

Will there be salvation during the millennium?

There will be salvation for none who reject Christ now or during the tribulation preaching. There will be salvation for all born during the millennium, but on the alone condition of faith, as now. That all will not believe during the millennium,—see Revelation 20:7-9.

Who will inhabit "the new earth" after the millennium?

The earthly people, or the inhabitants of the "new earth," are to be Jewish, the subjects of the "everlasting" Messianic kingdom promised to David's seed, Jesus Christ (2 Sam. 7:16; Isa. 9:7; Luke 1:32, 33). Doubtless they will be saved through the purgation of the earth by fire, as Noah and his family were preserved through the purgation of the earth by water.

What is the difference between "the gospel of the kingdom" and "the gospel of the grace of God"?

The "gospel of the kingdom" is the glad tidings that Christ is to set up His kingdom on earth, according to 2 Samuel 7:8-16; Luke 1:31-33; Acts 15:16, 17; Isaiah 11:1-12; Jeremiah 16:13-15; 23:5-8, etc.

The "gospel of the grace of God" is the glad tidings that, "now once in the end of the ages hath Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself"; and that "by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 13:39); that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Its formula is, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." It should be remembered that the gospel of the kingdom will be the peculiar testimony of the believing remnant during the great tribulation, after the Church is taken away, and before the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

What is the generation referred to in Matthew 24:34?

This must be taken to refer to the Jewish race or nation for the following reasons:

1. The Greek word *genea,* translated "generation," means primarily (as does indeed the English word), "race, kind, family, stock, breed" (Webster); "An age, race or generation of men" (Greenfield); "Men of the same stock, a family" (Thayer). To so interpret, therefore, the passage in question is but to give it its natural unforced meaning.

2. "All these things" of which Christ had been speaking were not fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. (a) The gospel had not then been preached in all the world. (b) There was no greater tribulation then than has

occurred hundreds of times since. (c) So far from the Son of Man then coming to gather His elect, the Jews were then dispersed and deported with a thoroughness never before equalled. (d) None of the things enumerated in Matthew 25 were then fulfilled.

3. The tribulation is yet future, because it is described in the Revelation, a book written after the destruction of Jerusalem.

4. And hence the return of the Lord is yet future.

LAW AND GRACE

Does the law serve any purpose in this dispensation, and in what way does the "new commandment" fulfill the law?

The Ten Commandments, with all Old Testament Scriptures, are as Paul says, "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." The Ten Commandments are an expression of God's will for His ancient people, Paul's Epistles express His will concerning the walk and worship of the Church. The great distinction is that in grace the believer is raised to the highest possible relationship and position, and then exhorted to "walk worthy" of such a place; while law is a testing of man in respect of obedience of God. "The man that doeth these things shall live by them."

Again, under law, obedience was the condition of life; under grace, obedience is the outcome of life. Under law, fear was the motive power of the life—under grace, love. A converted Jew, carefully instructed in all of the Jewish religion, remarked the other day that "a Jew knew nothing whatever of the love of God; that he obeyed through fear; that only as he came to know Christ crucified could he comprehend at all the love of God."

The "new commandment" of love (John 13:34) points the way to the fulfillment of the moral law—written on

the heart rather than on tables of stone, (Heb. 10:16). He who loves God will never dream of having any other God before Him; he who loves his neighbor will not kill him, nor bear false witness against him, nor covet anything that is his.

Note the higher ground to which the rule of life, as laid down in the New Testament, lifts the believer over and above the law:

Exodus 20:4, 5, cf. Acts 17:22-29; 1 John 5:21.

Exodus 20:7, cf. James 5:12; 1 Timothy 2:8; James 5:15, 16; Ephesians 6:18, etc.

Exodus 20:8, cf. Mark 2:23-28; Acts 20:7; Romans 14:5-13, 19, 22; Colossians 2:16, 17.

Exodus 20:12, cf. Ephesians 6:1; Colossians 3:20.

Exodus 20:13, cf. 1 John 3:15.

Exodus 20:14, cf. Matthew 5:28; Galatians 5:19; 1 Corinthians 10:6, 8.

Exodus 20:15, cf. Romans 12:17; Ephesians 4:28, etc.

Exodus 20:16, cf. Ephesians 4:25; James 4:11.

Exodus 20:17, cf. Ephesians 5:5; Colossians 3:5, etc.

Is the whole race under grace, or only the Church?

1. Only the saved are under grace as a rule of life. This being the age of grace, "whosoever will may come." The unsaved are still living under the measure of light they have: under condemnation of the law, if Jews (Rom. 3:19); under the accusing of conscience, if Gentiles who know neither law nor gospel (Rom. 2:12); under wrath if rejecting Christ (John 3:36).

2. The heathen who have not heard the gospel are responsible, not to the law, but to conscience and creation testimony, according to Romans 1.

What would be a brief analysis of Romans 6 to 8 for a sermon?

The theme of Romans 6:1 to 8:2 is stated in 6:1—"Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" "Sin," in

the question, and in Paul's answer, refers not to sins, or actual transgressions, but to the Adamic nature. The whole answer may be thus divided:

1. God reckons the believer to have died in Christ's death and to have been raised in His resurrection to "newness of life" (verses 1-10).

2. The believer must by faith "reckon" this to be true. "Sin" (the Adamic nature) is not dead, but the believer is to take account of himself as dead unto it (verse 11).

3. The third step in the believer's deliverance from "sin" is to yield "himself to God," and his "members instruments unto righteousness." It is the voluntary abdication of self-sovereignty, and the enthronement of God over the whole nature and life (verses 12, 13).

4. The fourth step is to cease to live under law, that is, to cease to endeavor to produce a holy character by effort under the precepts of the law, and to trust it all to the gracious power of God. This is the theme of what remains of this great passage, as will be seen by the following analysis: (a) The apostle answers the instinctive fear that the cessation of effort to keep the law will issue in a life of sin by returning to the question of yieldedness. The believer has chosen his Master; he has become by free choice in yielding himself to God a servant of righteousness (verses 16-22). (b) Moreover, the believer is reminded that he has become dead to the law by his co-crucifixion with Christ, so that it is no longer a question of going back to it. And not only so, to go back to law is infidelity to the new husband, Christ (7:1-4). (c) And then, to show the futility of a renewed man going back to law, the apostle gives his own experience while seeking, as a renewed man, to produce a holy character by legal obedience. That experience demonstrates that in the believer dwells still the old Adamic nature—"sin." It is "a law in the members" of the believer, though the new

nature is also there (7:5-25). (d) And now the apostle points to the real Deliverer, the Holy Spirit. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin" (8:2, 13; Gal. 5:16, 17). He is not delivered from "sin," but is delivered from the "law of sin," the lordship or rulership of sin.

The Bible does not teach the entire eradication of the Adamic nature, but does point out a way of deliverance from its dominion.

How would you distinguish the three classes mentioned in Hebrews 12:22-24?

This passage enumerates incidentally (for the purpose of the passage is a contrast between law and grace) the classes composing the heavenly citizenship. These are three: (1) "an innumerable company of angels"; (2) "the general assembly and church of the first-born"; and (3) "the spirits of just (or justified) men made perfect." The first includes the supra-mundane intelligences who have not sinned; the second, the saved of this dispensation between the first and second advents of Christ; the third, all other redeemed ones in preceding dispensations from Adam to Christ, and all future redeemed ones in the great tribulation and the millennium.

Is there any qualification of Paul's statement (Rom. 6:14) that the believer is not under the law?

The answer is that the apostle immediately adds a tremendously important qualification. The believer is "not under the law, but under grace." God's grace secures the doing of the will of God in and by the believer, through the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:2-4). "Not under the law," standing alone is antinomianism. "Not under the law, but under grace," is the gospel liberty, and ensures loving obedience—something the law never did, nor ever can do. The remedy for lawlessness is not preaching

the law, but preaching grace. The expression, "Not under the law as a means of life, but under the law as a rule of life," is an utterly unbiblical invention. It is the rule of life which is directly before the mind of the Spirit in Romans 6-8.

What is meant by the term, "Ye are not under the law, but under grace"?

The whole difference between law and grace is understood only as we come to really comprehend the new ground upon which grace lifts us, and to realize that life in this new realm is the spontaneous outcome of a new nature, imparted through the new birth, the dominant characteristic of which is love. This "new man" is not under the law, but under grace (Rom. 6:14). The Holy Spirit becomes the enabling and the only enabling for a life of love, and of a righteousness that includes all that the law demanded, and "the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Rom. 8:4.) The word "commandments" is used in the writings of John (1) in a general sense of the divine will, however revealed, "his word" (1 John 2:5), and (2), especially of the "law of Christ" (Gal. 6:2; 2 John 5; John 15:10-12).

"If ye love me, keep my commandments," said the Master, and He sums it all up in one word: "This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you" (John 15:12). Again, through Paul, he tells us that "he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law"; and then, specifying some of the commandments, he goes on to say that they are all briefly comprehended in this saying, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Take what commandment you will (aside from the ceremonial law, of course, which was for the Jew only), and apply to it this new principle of love, and it is evident that, because love worketh no

ill to his neighbor, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

In those who keep this new commandment of Christ, John tells us, is the love of God perfected (1 John 4:12). So long as a life is expressing the love of Christ, consciously or unconsciously, in that life is the law fulfilled in all its righteousness. Paul states the whole principle in the terms of experience in Galatians 2:20. Christ Himself, by His own life, imparted in the new birth, is living in us and through us this new love life. No effort on our part can accomplish this, as Romans 7:7-24 demonstrates, but a continual reckoning that the "old man" has been crucified with Christ, therefore we are dead to it; that we now have within us His own resurrection life, as a reality, not a mere doctrine; that that life is actualized by the Holy Spirit who dwells in our bodies; and that as we "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8:4), not only do we "not fulfill the lust of the flesh" (Gal. 5:16), but "the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us" (Rom. 8:4).

This is what Paul means in Romans 3:31: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid! Yea, we establish the law."

When a sinner confesses his guilt under the law, and his desert of death, he "establishes" the law as a ministry of condemnation (Rom. 3:19; Gal. 3:10). When he believes on Christ, the law is "established" as a "schoolmaster unto Christ." And then, having received the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4) and the eternal life of Christ (John 3:14-16), and the Holy Spirit as indwelling (John 4:14, 1 Cor. 6:19), and walking in yieldedness to the Spirit, the "righteousness of the law," *viz.*, a life dominated by love, is "established" within.

What saved a sinning Israelite when breaking an inexorable law?

It should be remembered that when the law of duty, in

the Ten Commandments, was given, God also gave a law of mercy in priesthood and sacrifices. An Israelite who broke the law of duty could resort to the law of mercy. But on the divine side, the Israelite was forgiven because his offering pointed to Christ. In this way God "passed over the sins done aforetime" (Rom. 3:24-26; Heb. 9:1-14).

Reply to a legalist who contended that since Christ kept the law, we His followers were in duty bound to follow His example and teaching.

1. Christ was "born of a woman" "made under the law."

2. He kept the law.

3. He freed the law from traditionalism and drew it from the scabbard of rabbinical interpretation.

4. He was a "minister of the circumcision" (Rom. 15:8) not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. His ministry, therefore, was not to the Church. Church truth, position, walk and reward were among the "things" (John 16:12) that even His disciples were not able to bear before Pentecost.

5. Since Christ was a minister of the law, made under the law, and living under the law, to adopt as a rule of life His rule, is to go back and live under law.

6. Such a position is precisely identical with that of the schismatics in Corinth who said—"and I of Christ." That is, they justified legality not by an appeal to Mosaism, but to the example of Christ, ignoring (or not knowing) that to "fulfill" the law He must not only bear its curse on the tree, but live under it.

7. The legality of the synoptic Gospels is expressly declared to be "kingdom" truth, and we are members of the body and bride of the King, not subjects of the kingdom.

8. If the epistles are inspired, they are authoritative, not advisory, or suggestive, as to the principles of the

Christian's walk. It is not open to an obedient member of Christ's body to justify a return to the legality under which the Son of God graciously humbled Himself to live.

9. There is no unselfishness, disinterestedness, compassion or self-sacrifice painfully wrought out under obedience to law that is not spontaneously and joyfully produced under grace.

10. The defective conception of Christian obligation current among unbelieving, self-indulgent church members, is not to be cured by legality.

11. For such a position, the Acts, Epistles and Revelation might as well be non-existent.

The serious aspects of such a position are:

1. We are cutting off the only divinely-given means of holiness. Under the law-system, painful righteousness is possible, but not liberty, joyousness, and victory.

2. Converts are kept in a modified Galatianism.

3. It is an experiment which has invariably resulted disastrously to gospel liberty. The book, "In His Steps," is along that line—"What would Jesus do?" Now in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it is just one's guess as to what Christ would do. If, on the other hand, we "walk in the Spirit," are "led by the Spirit,"—checked by such precepts as are given to instruct the believer of this dispensation, you are in a path where every step is demonstrable and sure.

There is, we are told, an almost irresistible tendency among missionaries to grow legal. Hudson Taylor speaks of this. They see how crude a sense of even common decency the converts are likely to have, and they see, too, that they are pretty sure to use liberty for an occasion to the flesh. The natural resource is authority. But in 1 Corinthians, where both these tendencies (to anarchy, self-sufficiency and immorality) had ripened into a shameful condition, the apostle refrains utterly from the smallest

tinge of legality. He well knew there was no other remedy but grace.

MANUSCRIPTS, TRANSLATIONS, ETC.

Of what authoritative value are the manuscripts when there are so many of them?

While there are thousands of scrolls or manuscripts of the Old Testament in existence, these are all copies of the manuscripts prepared from ancient sources by Jewish rabbis in the 6th century, and this is called the Massoretic text. The collateral authority is the Greek translation of the Old Testament called the Septuagint translation, 274 years B. C. into Greek, so that the Old Testament writings were preserved by both Jewish and Gentile scholarship. Between the Septuagint and the Massoretic text the divisions are very slight and not of a kind to change the meaning of any passage. I may add that what gives the Septuagint its exceptional value is that it was in the hands of the apostles, and the New Testament quotations from the Old Testament are frequently made from the Septuagint version.

If the Apocryphal books were discarded from the Old Testament how can we say that we have the whole Word of God?

No books were discarded. The Hebrews also had, as have we, the books called "Apocryphal," but did not give them the character of inspired writings.

Which are the best manuscripts extant?

Of the New Testament, the Sinaitic and Vatican. But it is to be remembered that quotations from the original manuscripts abound in the writings of the so-called "Apostolic Fathers," and these are considered on a par with the Sinaitic and the Vatican manuscripts as text sources. As to the Old Testament, the authoritative Greek rendering is

of course the Septuagint, the Greek translation made in Alexandria, 270 B. C. The Hebrew Massoretic text is everywhere accessible in print.

Which version of the Bible is preferable for use in public work, the King James, or the Revised Version?

The King James, or Authorized Version, remains the Bible of the people, and is, therefore, best for the minister's public work. He should, of course, be acquainted with the revised renderings of all the passages in which important changes are made, and should not hesitate to call attention to the better and clearer readings.

It is, however, a mistake to make incessant reference to verbal changes, as the habit of some is, and it is a safe rule never to make public reference to the renderings of individual translators, as Rotherham, Hudson and others. In the main the A. V. is a magnificent translation of the Scriptures.

By what authority could a small body of scholars exclude the Apocryphal books from the Bible?

No book holds its place in the Bible by virtue of the authority of scholars, but by virtue of the universal consensus of the whole church. Learning has nothing (or but little) to do with it. The non-canonical books wholly lack the peculiar elevation, restraint, consistency and spiritual impression of the canonical books. Compare, for example, the Epistles of Clement, an associate of the Apostle Paul, with the writings of the latter; or the so-called "Gospel of the Infancy" with the first three chapters of Luke.

In Paul's visit to Jerusalem (Acts 21:15) was he acting out of harmony with the leading of the Spirit, as some teachers claim, and if so what is the proof?

Acts 21:4 is conclusive that in his last journey to Jerusalem the great apostle to the Gentiles was acting rather

out of his consuming love for the Jews (Rom. 9:1-3), and his yearning desire to see them saved (Rom. 10:1-3) than, as usual, in perfect subjection to the guidance of the Spirit. There is no more reason why this should shock us than to learn that Peter dissembled at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14). Paul himself set the matter in its true light after his arrest (Acts 23:17-21), when he confessed that he had long before been warned of the Lord that the Jews at Jerusalem would not receive his testimony, and that when he remonstrated with the Lord he received the command, "Depart, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles." But for the curious notion that everything Paul (why Paul more than Peter?) did was inerrant, no one would ever have tried to explain away so plain a scripture as Acts 21:4. Let it be remembered that not the *men* of the Bible, but the Bible itself is inerrant. A very faulty man may write a faultless letter, and all the more is this true when it is remembered that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

Would not the fact that the New Testament quotations from the Septuagint are so often imperfect, involve the inspiration of one or the other?

There are exceedingly few *ipsissima verba* quotations in the New Testament from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. The New Testament quotations are therefore inspired renderings into Greek of the Old Testament truths. Often (perhaps generally) the Septuagint is followed, with minute differences. This undoubtedly gives the Septuagint a unique place among versions. For two reasons the Massoretic text is to be preferred to the Septuagint where differences occur. (1) The text of the Septuagint is in a most uncertain state. Unlike the Hebrew text the Septuagint version was never ecclesiastically guarded. Origen (185-254 A. D.) endeavored to restore it, but with doubtful success. (2) On the other hand the

Hebrew text was scrupulously guarded, every letter having been numbered, and copies were revised with extraordinary care. To this work, from the Christian era, the Massora were especially devoted, and the present form of the Hebrew text is highly authoritative. That neither the Septuagint nor the Massoretic text was followed with literal exactness in New Testament quotations presents no difficulty whatever in respect of verbal inspiration, for both in the Old Testament and the New it is one Author who speaks. Consistency require that the sense should be the same; but as it is an Author quoting Himself, He is at liberty to restate His own proposition. No merely human author is bound to quote himself *ipsissima verba;* and this just because it is himself. Another would have no such right over quoted words. In other words, a New Testament quotation from the Old presents the phenomena of two inspired forms of the same statement. They are equally authoritative and the sense is always the same. A striking illustration of this is the quotation in Hebrews 10:5 ("Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me") from Psalm 40:6 ("Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou digged"). The reference in the Psalm is to that boring of the ear of a Hebrew servant, by which he voluntarily became the absolute property of his master. The New Testament form expresses the same central thought but in words adapted to express the self-devotedness of Christ as Servant of Jehovah in His obedience even unto death. Both forms of the one truth are verbally inspired, since both came from the same Author-Spirit (2 Tim. 3:16; 1 Cor. 2:10-13). It is noteworthy that throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews Old Testament quotations are usually attributed not to the writer, as "the prophet Esaias," etc., but to the Author, as "The Holy Ghost saith" (see *e. g.,* 3:7; 9:8, etc.)

What is meant by "the Canon of Scripture"?

1. The word *canon* means primarily what a modern mechanic calls a "straight edge." By accommodation it came to stand for authority, *e. g.*, rules which, in the sphere of conduct or belief, keep one "straight." In theology the word came to be used as applying to the authority of Scripture. And the question concerning any particular book, "Is it canonical?" is equivalent to asking, "Is it authoritative?" Hence the "canon" means the collection of books accepted as inspired and therefore authoritative in the sphere of belief and conduct.

2. The history of "the canon" or of the process through which the writings which now compose the Bible have been accepted as "canonical" (authoritative) is full of interest and of comfort. It falls into two parts, the history of the Old Testament and the history of the New Testament canon.

(a) *The Old Testament Canon.* Into the detail of the formation of the Old Testament it is not necessary to enter, and that for the most satisfactory of all possible reasons. It is undisputed and indisputable that the Old Testament as we have it was in the hands of Christ—was, indeed, His Bible. It consisted then, as now, of "Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms" (Luke 24:44). "Moses" included the "five-fold book or Pentateuch; "the Prophets" included the historical books as well as the predictive writings, and "the Psalms" the poetical books. This canon, as every candid reader of the Gospels may see, was accepted by the Lord Jesus as absolutely binding and authoritative. He quoted from each of the great divisions, invariably giving the quotations the weight of divine authority, and in such passages as Luke 24:27, 44, 45; John 5:46, 47; 7:19; 17:17; Luke 16:31 and many other like instances, He gave to the canonicity (*i. e.*, authority) of the entire Old Testament the stamp of His own divine approval.

(b) *The New Testament Canon.* It may be said that the New Testament is made up of the books which have triumphed over a two-fold opposition. (1) Every one of these books has been sifted and tested by hostile criticism, and each remains in the canon because it has vindicated its canonicity (*i. e.,* authority) to the piety, the experience and the learning of the enormous majority of nearly seventy generations of Christians. This, needless to say, invests these writings with a vastly more impressive, venerable and unanswerable authority than could be given them by any council. It is not that the canon is destitute of conciliar authentication, for this it has, beginning with the third council of Carthage in 397, but that the agreement of the whole church, in all ages, constitutes a consensus of more majestic weight. And, (2) the New Testament canon has survived the contest which the spurious books such as the (so-called) "Gospel of the Infancy," and with genuine but uninspired books such as the Epistle of Clement. In the four-fold testing of tradition, experience, spiritual intuition and learning the non-canonical books have been universally rejected—the canonical books universally received.

It will be understood, of course, that "universal" refers to the judgment not alone of councils, but of the Christian consciousness of the whole church in all of the ages. That in every age a few have objected to certain books cannot impair this catholicity, since the few have never surpassed, either in learning or spirituality, the many. Such divergencies are, therefore, referable to idiosyncrasies and the mental bias of individuals.

MISCELLANEOUS

Where in the Bible is the doctrine of the Trinity explicitly taught?

The Old Testament, without directly teaching the doctrine of the Trinity, does teach a plurality in the God-

head (*e. g.*, Gen. 1:26; 3:22, where "Elohim" is a plural noun), and intimates a trinity (*e. g.*, Isa. 6:3, etc.). The Trinity is necessarily implied in Luke 3:22. The Holy Spirit descends upon Jesus, and the Father's voice from heaven declares the divine Sonship. The doctrine of the Trinity is explicitly taught in the baptismal formula, Matthew 28:19.

How do you get 427 years from the Flood to the call of Abram?

In the genealogical table as given in the King James Version, the dates from the Flood to the call of Abram figure out 367 years. But Acts 7:4 informs us that Abram left Haran after Terah's death. He was then 75 years old. Terah was 205 years old when he died. This would make Terah 130 years old when Abram was born—a difference of 70 years. Add 70 to 367 and we have 427 from the Flood to the call of Abram.

Would not Ecclesiastes 7:16 prove that it is possible to be too religious?

"Be not righteous overmuch," refers to scrupulosity above what is written—excessive and strength-destroying fasting, and such like fleshly exercises. The "flagellantes" and "penitentes" of Romanist countries illustrate this. See the next verse: "For why shouldst thou destroy thyself?" (Col. 2:16, 17, 20, 23).

Can we say that the Deuteronomic Covenant is an unconditional one in view of such passages as Deuteronomy 30:10?

The Deuteronomic Covenant (Deut. 30:1-9) secures unconditionally the restoration and conversion of Israel. The chapter then goes on to take up the blessing of Israel after its restoration and conversion, and then conditions enter, for all blessing is conditional. Salvation and restoration

to Palestine are unconditionally promised. The same is true indeed of the Christian in this age. We are saved under the unconditional covenant with Abraham, but our happiness and spiritual prosperity depend on certain conditions.

Who was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews?

No author is named, so the question is fairly open to investigation. From the earliest times, the Epistle has been variously ascribed, but the greater number of writers accept Pauline authorship; the lesser number think Apollos wrote it. It is a mistake to call it an epistle. It is not a letter. All writers admit the strong Pauline tone of the book. My own conclusion is that it is made up of notes of Paul's synagogue addresses, taken down by Luke or Tertius or some one of Paul's amanuenses and revised by him. That accounts both for the Pauline flavor and for the declamatory rather than epistolary form.

Was Abraham a Jew?

No, he was a Hebrew. The name Jew sprang from Judah.

It is said in your Bible Course that we do not consecrate ourselves. Kindly explain the words "consecrate yourselves" in Leviticus.

The words "consecrate yourselves" of which you may find many instances in Scripture, means no more than "separate yourselves,"—*i. e.,* from defilement. The objection referred to was to the common idea of consecration, so prevalent among young Christians, where they are continually "reconsecrating" themselves to God.

What is the difference between soul and spirit?

Briefly stated, the difference between soul and spirit is the difference in Scripture usage, between the words "mind"

and "heart." The spirit is that part of man which knows, —the intellect, or mind (1 Cor. 2:11). The soul is the seat of the will, appetites, affections, desires.

Is it right for a minister to unite in marriage people who are not Christians?

Most of the states constitute ordained ministers civil officers for the purpose of performing marriages, and marriage is in the eye of the law a civil contract. If, therefore, a minister chooses to unite persons neither of whom is a Christian, it would seem to be within his right. The Scriptures forbid the marriage of believers to unbelievers (2 Cor. 6:14).

What is Nicolaitanism, spoken of in Revelation 2:6, 15?

It is the doctrine that God has instituted an order of "clergy," or priests, as distinguished from the "laity." The word is formed from two Greek words, *niko,* conqueror, or overcomer, and *laos,* the people. The New Testament knows nothing of a "clergyman," still less of a priest, except as all sons of God in this dispensation are "a royal priesthood." In the apostolic church there were offices, elders (or bishops), and deacons; and "gifts," apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers (Eph. 4:11). These might or might not be elders or deacons. But late in the apostolic period there emerged a disposition to arrogate to elders alone authority to administer ordinances, and, generally, to constitute themselves a class between God and the people; they were the Nicolaitanes. You will observe that what were "deeds" in the Ephesus, or late apostolic period, had become a "doctrine" two hundred years later in the Pergamos, or Constantine period.

What is the meaning of "communicate" in Galatians 6:6?

Those who are taught are commanded to support those who teach the Word of God.

What did Paul mean by "delivering such an one over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh" in 1 Corinthians 5:5?

Job was allowed to remain in Satan's power for a time that the destruction of his flesh might bring him to self-knowledge and humiliation before God, which it did. So with this case. Not given over to Satan for the destruction of the soul, but of the flesh. So even Satan is made to serve a purpose in the kingdom of God.

What was the gift of "discerning of spirits" in 1 Corinthians 12:10?

A gift that all Spirit-filled Christians have that makes them able to discern false doctrine, such as taught by Spiritualists, Christian Scientists, Theosophists, etc.

Can you give the quotation concerning various motives in desiring to know, each ending with the author's judgment upon the motive?

The quotation from Bernard of Clairvaux concerning what you ask is: "There are some who desire to know with the sole purpose that they may know, and it is base curiosity; and some who desire to know that they may be known, and it is base ambition; and some who desire to know that they may sell their knowledge for wealth and honor, and it is base avarice; but there are some who desire to know that they may be edified, and it is prudence; and some who desire to know that they may help others, and it is charity."

Could Nebuchadnezzar be considered a believer and therefore a saved man?

Daniel 4:34-37 seems to leave no doubt that Nebuchadnezzar became a worshipper of Jehovah in the true sense of faith.

Who are "the friends of the bridegroom" in John 3:29?

The Old Testament saints, who, through the sacrifices, were saved by the prospective sacrifice of Christ. See also 1 Corinthians 15:23. John Baptist, the last of the Old Testament saints, is in this class.

How is the word "world" to be interpreted in the New Testament?

The word "world" in the King James version of the New Testament is in hopeless confusion, because it is used to translate three Greek words which have widely different meanings. In a very large number of cases "world" is used to render the Greek *aion,* which is a measure or period of time and should be rendered "age." Any good analytical concordance (as Young's or Strong's) will show these words and their distinctive meanings; and these can be easily noted on the margin of a Bible.

What is the meaning of "Selah" found in some of the Psalms?

"Selah," a word which occurs seventy-four times in the Bible, chiefly in the Psalms, is of doubtful meaning. All agree that it was a musical direction to the singers or players in the temple worship. It probably means "pause," indicating that the singers were to pause while the players went on. It ought to be omitted in the public reading of the Psalms.

What is the meaning of the expression in 1 Corinthians 12:13—"have been all made to drink into one Spirit"?

The expression means, made to receive the one Spirit. The figure was used by Christ in John 4:14.

How do the Jews interpret Isaiah 53?

They apply it to their own nation, suffering at the hands of the Gentiles. As to Christ, the vail is still upon their hearts. Not until they see Him will they understand that the suffering Saviour was their own Messiah, and then will they mourn for Him in true sorrow and penitence, the vail being taken away. Thomas and Paul illustrate (1 Cor. 15:8; Rev. 1:7; John 20:27, 28; also see Zech. 12:10).

Is it true that God chastises adults by afflicting their children?

That the sins of the parents are visited upon their children inheres in that law of God which we call heredity no less than in His written Word. It is one of the awful consequences of sin, and is an inevitable result of the solidarity of the race. But the unity of humanity has blessings which enormously overbalance this disadvantage. But this "common lot of man" is a very different thing from the horrible notion taught by some that the Almighty, to punish a parent, will afflict a child.

When Paul says (Acts 20:22) "And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem," does he refer to his own mind or spirit, as in Job 32:8, or to the Holy Spirit?

To his own human spirit and not to the Holy Spirit. That this was the opinion of the translators is evidenced by the use of the small "s" in all correct copies of the A. V. as well as the R. V. Darby's translation, the work of the

most profound Bible student of modern times, renders the passage, "And now, behold, bound in my spirit I go to Jerusalem." Probably the question never would have arisen (otherwise than of necessity in the minds of translators and revisers) except for the supposed necessity of vindicating Paul in taking his last journey to Jerusalem. Paul never claimed for himself either infallibility or impeccability.

Was Abraham's intercession for the city of Sodom, or for the righteous in Sodom alone?

For the city because of the righteous in it. It had not occurred to the friend of God that He might take the righteous out before the destruction. Still, it is interesting to see that the city would have been spared if there had been ten righteous in it.

To whom was Hebrews 13:13 addressed, and what was "the camp" from which they were called to "go out"?

Hebrews 13:13 was addressed to Jews while the temple was yet standing and Judaism in full organization. Judaism was "the camp," and the allusion is to the act of Moses (Ex. 33:7), the significance of which, as every Jew knew, was that for the time God had departed from the midst of His earthly people. To build upon this a doctrine of separation from the churches is to build a doctrine upon mere inference and analogy—a method never defensible, and which is responsible for most of the errors in theology.

What is the process by which a doctrine is formulated from the Scriptures?

The doctrine of Scripture is to be ascertained by a fair construction of all the passages bearing upon the given subject. If, concerning the ultimate fate of Satan, Ezekiel

28:19 stood alone, one would be warranted in teaching his annihilation. But Revelation 19:20 with Revelation 20:10 teach the eternal conscious torment of Satan. The earlier teaching in Ezekiel must be construed in harmony with this final word if it may fairly be done. A reference to Ezekiel's phrase, "And never shalt thou be any more," shows a very simple harmony. From verse 13 the Spirit speaks of the earthly activity and manifestation of Satan. The natural construction, therefore, is that the obscure phrase quoted predicts the end of his long and pernicious dealing with the race of men.

The imperative rules of interpretation are: (1) Never use an obscure passage to contradict a plain and definite one. (2) All the passages must be so interpreted as to make all stand. (3) Interpretation must take account of the progressive method of revelation. Much is difficult and obscure in the Old Testament which is comparatively cleared up in the New (see Heb. 1:1, 2, in the R. V.).

Is the chronology of Daniel in relation to the crucifixion correct?

As to the chronology of Daniel in relation to the precise time of the cutting off of Messiah, it is to be remembered, first, that Daniel 9:26 is obviously an indeterminate period. The date of the crucifixion is not fixed by it. The cutting off of Messiah is only said to be "*after* the three score and two weeks." Remember also that three decrees concerning Jerusalem are recorded,—that of Cyrus, B. C. 536 (2 Chr. 36:22, 23; Ezra 1:1, 3); that of Darius, B. C. 521-486 (Ezra 6:3-8), and that of Artaxerxes in his seventh year, probably B. C. 458 (Ezra 7:7). Artaxerxes, in his twentieth year, B. C. 444, gave permission for the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem, and probably that is the decree from which the first seven weeks, or 49 years, run. Quoting from a note in the "Scofield Reference Bible," page 915:—"Prophetic time is invariably so near as to give full

warning, so indeterminate as to give no satisfaction to mere curiosity (cf. Matt. 24:36; Acts 1:7).

Is there any warrant for saying that Judas repented after his betrayal of Christ?

Not with the heart, else he would not have gone "to his own place," which we must believe to be the place of the lost. Jesus Himself said that Judas was "a devil."

What is it to know Christ "after the flesh" (2 Cor. 5:16)?

An intellectual belief in the historical Christ, which is distinct from "believing on Him." The latter implies trust, dependence. Intellectual belief does not bring salvation, as belief with trust does to those who truly, with the heart as well as the mind, believe.

Please explain Jesus' treatment of the woman in Matthew 15:21-28.

Addressed by a Gentile as son of David, He makes no reply, for a Gentile has no claim upon Him in that character. When she addresses Him as Lord, she obtained an answer (see Rom. 10:12, 13).

What is the teaching referred to as "the kenosis"?

The doctrine of "the kenosis" is variously stated by those who hold it, but all of them agree that Philippians 2:7, R.V., teaches that our Lord so "emptied himself" that He did not know whether or not Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or whether Deuteronomy was a forgery, or a veritable product of inspiration. The teaching of the passage really is that being *en morphe*—*i. e.*, wearing the external appearance of God, He counted not that appearance a prize to be grasped, but emptied Himself of it (Phil 2:6, 7). The kenotic theory is modern and owes its appearance in Christian polemics to the necessity which lies upon the

critics of getting rid of the testimony of Christ to the authority of the Old Testament.

How are we to distinguish between the terms "disciple" and "apostle"?

It is not always easy to make a distinction. The apostles were often called disciples, but the distinction was not of great importance. Some powers were exercised by the apostles as such. For example, to Peter was given the keys of the kingdom, and to all of the apostles, the power of communicating the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands so long as the gospel was preached only to the Jews, but as the apostles had and can have no successors, the distinction soon ceased to be of any vital importance. John 15:27 is adduced in connection with our Lord's statement, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot hear them now," and the promise that when the Holy Spirit should come they should be taught all things, as tending naturally and strongly to show that the Spirit was to speak through these commissioned men, and historically there is ample confirmation of that interpretation, for through those men the New Testament was written.

Is there a passage in the New Testament which settles conclusively the question of divorce?

The New Testament teaching as to marriage and divorce is not to be gathered from any single passage, but from the harmony of them all. This is admirably done in the Westminster Confession, chapter 24, sections i-vi. There is a shameful and unscriptural laxity in the United States in respect of marriage and divorce. It threatens not only the spirituality of the churches, but the very integrity of society. But these evils are not to be cured by an extra biblical strictness, but only by a steadfast demand that this most vital of all human relations shall be regulated neither by lust nor by Pharisaism, but by the mind of God as revealed in the Scriptures.

Please explain 1 Corinthians 3:17: "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy."

It is to be interpreted literally. The "temple of God" here is the church. There were false teachers among the Corinthians who not only lived loosely themselves, but advocated licentious practices in the church; and any who so corrupt, pollute, defile the church of God, is in danger of destruction.

Were the tabernacles of Exodus 33:7 and 40:2 identical?

No. The former seems to have been that tent over which the pillar of cloud and fire had rested, and before which the primitive patriarchal sacrifices, afterward superseded by the Levitical sacrifices, were offered.

What did Christ mean by "they shall be your judges" in speaking of Beelzebub in Matthew 12:27?

The Pharisees were quick enough to resent any implication of Satanic power so far as they and their sons were concerned, but on the ground they were taking, *i. e.*, that Christ cast out demons by Beelzebub, their own sons would adjudge them inconsistent; for if the power to cast out demons is Satanic, then whoever exercises such power is in league with the source of that power. In the following verses Jesus proves from whence His power came—from God, not from Satan.

For what purpose was the Urim and Thummim?

The Urim and Thummim, meaning "lights and perfections," were connected in some way, not clearly expressed, with the ascertainment of the divine will in particular cases. What they were or what became of them is not known.

Why was God angry with David for numbering the people?

Counting on the numerical strength of his army rather than on the power of God. 1 Chronicles 21:1 and 2 Samuel 24:1 should be read together. God allows Satan to influence His servant David because of his lack of faith, and fleshly expedient. For similar cases see 1 Corinthians 5:5 and 1 Timothy 1:20; also Job.

In Philippians 3:6 where Paul speaks of being "blameless as touching the righteousness of the law," what did he mean?

By blamelessness as touching the law, Paul meant that when he had sinned under the law, he had always brought the required offering.

Have we any proof that Adam was a saved man?

The proof that Adam was saved is two-fold—the evidence of his faith in calling his wife Eve, "the mother of all living," solely upon the promise of God and before he had ever seen a child (Gen. 3:15); and the symbolical act of God in clothing him with coats of skins (Gen. 4:21). Adam's attempt to clothe himself miserably failed, as self-righteousness always does—then God clothed him (Phil. 3:5-9; Luke 18:10-14).

Is the book of Job allegorical, and where is it to be placed chronologically?

The book of Job is to be regarded as historical, pre-Mosaic, patriarchal. As to proof of the historicity of Job himself, see Ezekiel 14:14, observing that it is the Lord God who makes the declaration. The early date is established by internal evidence. There is no mention of the law, nor of Moses, nor of the Levitical sacrifices, nor of the Exodus. The length of life is patriarchal; sun worship is mentioned, but not idols; riches are reckoned by cattle;

the head of the family is the priest; there is no allusion to a Hebrew, or to Jerusalem, or to the tabernacle or temple.

Of what significance in Scripture is the number "forty"?

In several instances it seems to signify the fullness of *testing*. Moses spent forty years on the backside of the desert (cf. Acts 7:23 with Ex. 7:7). The children of Israel wandered for forty years in the wilderness. Jesus was in the wilderness for forty days and nights. How significant that each of these times of testing occurred in the wilderness! So with our times of testing. Again, for forty centuries before Christ the world was under probation, etc.

What is the meaning of "He went and preached to the spirits in prison" (see 1 Peter 3:19)?

It is interpreted in three ways: (1) It is said that between Christ's crucifixion and resurrection He went into Hades and offered salvation through His cross to all the wicked dead; (2) that He preached in Hades declaratively —merely announcing the consummation of the predicted sacrifice to those who had rejected the promises during Old Testament times. The objection to the first interpretation is that the context of the verse limits the preaching to a particular class of sinners—those antediluvians who rejected Noah's gospel. Such favor to a special class of sinners who were warned for 120 years before the flood came is inconceivable. The objection to the second interpretation is that it puts Christ in the position of, so to speak, taunting the irredeemably lost—which is also inconceivable. He might have wept over them; He could never have exulted over them; (3) the third interpretation harmonizes the passage, the context, and the known character of the Redeemer. It is best stated in paraphrase. "Christ . . . was quickened by the Spirit, by which Spirit in the

days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, and the long suffering of God waited, He preached to those who are now imprisoned spirits" awaiting the judgment.

What book of the Bible would you recommend for a young convert just beginning Bible study?

First Thessalonians. That epistle was written by Paul to young converts. It should be deeply studied. Afterwards give your young converts a course in Galatians to establish them in the doctrines of grace; following with Philippians, which presents right Christian experience. After this, take up Luke and John.

What became of the tabernacle after the temple was built?

It is not recorded. The ark of the covenant, and "all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle," were carried into the temple (1 Kings 8:4). In the Revelation (11:19) the ark is seen in heaven. The temple which was standing in our Lord's mortal life was built by one of the Herods on the site of Solomon's Temple.

How are we to understand Paul's words in 2 Corinthians 12:16—"being crafty, I caught you with guile"?

They should be read as an ironical exclamation. The whole context, as Hengstenberg, Meyer, and other exegetes point out, is "bitterly ironical." The Corinthians, caught in the snare of Judaizing teachers who deny Paul's apostleship and impugn his motives, have "compelled" (verse 11) him to justify himself. So he reminds them that the "signs of an apostle were wrought among them" in three ways—"in all patience, in signs and wonders, and in mighty deeds." Moreover, his purity of motive was shown by his refusal to be burdensome to them. Then (verse 16) follows the exclamation. Doubtless the apostle quoted

some accusation of the Judaizers. It was a way of saying, "Though I could work miracles among you, and though my way of life showed me to be absolutely disinterested, yet they dare to say that I descended to craftiness and guile to make converts." The accusation is absurd.

Are the days of Genesis literal days of twenty-four hours?

The usage of Scripture warrants the common present-day belief that lengthened periods are meant (2 Pet. 3:8; John 5:25, etc.). On the other hand, the power of God warrants one in believing that the work apportioned to each of the creative "days" could have been accomplished in days of twenty-four hours.

Does the word "replenish" in Genesis 1:28 have any bearing on the question of an inhabitation of earth prior to the creation of Adam?

The theory in question rests mainly on the verse referred to. There are, we think, insuperable objections to the theory of a previous inhabitation of the earth by human beings. The arguments for an occupation of the earth by angels prior to the creation of man, are, however, extremely convincing. It should be added, that opinion on these questions are within the liberty of faith, since there is not so clear a teaching upon them as warrants a dogmatic assertion.

Is not the giving of teas, suppers, etc., a sinful way of raising money for the Lord's work?

Church "teas," "suppers," etc., for the raising of money are not explicitly forbidden, and therefore cannot be called "sinful." But they are contrary to the spirit of Scripture, and would be wholly unnecessary if 1 Corinthians 16:2 were obeyed. Such expedients do not tend toward spirituality and the church which allows them becomes the butt of the

ungodly. A converted hand in its own pocket is the biblical means of "raising" money for the Lord.

If Israel's distinctive blessing is earthly, will not Abraham, Jacob, David and all godly Israelites have to remain on earth at the resurrection to enter into their inheritance?

The fact that the distinctive promise to Israel is of earthly blessing and prosperity does not require that Abraham, Jacob and David should, "at the first resurrection, remain on the earth in the enjoyment of earthly blessing." The men named have all had great earthly blessing. It should be remembered, too, that the earthly blessings were not unconditionally promised to Israelites just because they were Israelites, but only as they should be obedient (see Deut. 28).

What was the light of John 1:9, "which lighteth every man that cometh into the world"?

The light of conscience, which is given to every man, and which makes him morally responsible. This conscience is spiritual as coming from God, but must not be confounded with the new birth, which comes to those who, seeing the true Light, Christ, believe on Him and thus follow the light of John 1:9. The standard by which God will judge those who have not received a knowledge of Christ is revealed in Romans 1:18 to 3:19.

Are not the rewards of the Christian now sufficient without his seeking future ones?

Upon the subject of rewards the Scriptures are imperative, and we must not only bow our minds under the authority of the Word, but find in these rewards the incentive which Paul found in them. Consider how intense his language is in Philippians 3:13, 14; 1 Corinthians 9:24-27; how triumphant his assurance in 2 Timothy 4:7, 8.

But it would be absurd to suppose that these crowns are material circlets of gold, like an earthly monarch's crown; 1 Thessalonians 2:19 would disprove that: Paul's Thessalonian converts will be his eternal crown of rejoicing. So, of each of the crowns: they stand for great results of service, ministry, suffering, etc., because in the gaining of them character is grown, Christ is apprehended, fellowship is deepened, and the whole being fitted for the great service and kingly offices of the eternal state.

Again, we go against Scripture when we say that our rewards are now as we go along. Paul's word is: "Henceforth" . . . "in that day." Christ's word, "Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be."

What is the meaning of the conflict between the two seeds of Genesis 3:15?

Enmity was declared between the two seeds. The promise of redemption is contained in the last clause: "It (the seed of the woman) shall bruise thy (Satan's) head (seat of power and dominion), and thou shalt bruise his (Christ's) heel." On the cross Christ was wounded by Satan, but not vitally. It only hindered His onward march for a time.

Is there any scriptural proof that Judas was excluded from the Lord's Supper?

The proof that Judas was excluded from the Lord's Supper (though not from the Passover feast) is found in a comparison of the four-fold account. John 13:1-30 gives the order of events up to the institution of the Lord's Supper. It is as follows: (1) The Passover is eaten, verses 1, 2; (2) the feet-washing, verses 3-17; (3) the exposure and departure of Judas, verses 18-30. Certainly up to this point there has been no Lord's Supper. Turning then to Matthew 26:20-25 we find that the Lord's

Supper was not instituted till after the conversation about the betrayer, and John has shown us that the end of that conversation was the departure of Judas. John does not give the institution of the supper, but Matthew and Mark do, and both put it after the conversation about the betrayer. The following passages read in order, give the complete order of events: (1) John 13:1-17; (2) John 13:18-29 with Matthew 26:21-25; (3) John 13:30, 31; (4) Matthew 26:26-29.

How can we be a "sweet savor unto God"—in them that perish (2 Cor. 2:15)?

We preach Christ to a mixed audience,—some accept, some reject, some saved, some perish, but we are, in so doing, a sweet savor unto God and our service acceptable and our reward sure, whether our hearers accept or reject our message of salvation.

What was Moses' sin in striking the rock twice?

God told Moses to speak to the rock, and his sin lay: (1) In disobeying God's command by striking the rock. (2) In presumption and self-aggrandizement: "Must *we* fetch you water out of the rock?" (3) Because of the preceding, he destroyed the type of Christ which God intended the rock to symbolize. Christ by one sacrifice, gave the water of life to His people (Hebrews 9:28). A second striking of the rock would, typically, signify that one atonement was not sufficient in God's purpose and plan, but that Christ must needs suffer again.

Is it not difficult to know on what one should take a firm, sure stand in these days?

No, it ought not to be, since the Holy Scriptures give that foundation. No one who bows his whole being in obedience to the Bible has ever been put to shame, or made shipwreck of life.

Please explain Ephesians 4:8 : "When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men."

"Captivity" refers to the powers of darkness and death, which were conquered by the atonement and resurrection of our Lord. The "gifts" may be found in Ephesians 4:10-12. But in His ascension Christ transferred "paradise" to the third heaven, with all the souls of the redeemed of past ages.

What does Paul mean by referring to the commandments in 1 Corinthians 7:19?

Paul refers to the commandments in an illustrative way merely. He by no means intends to set aside such unqualified declarations as Romans 6:14; Galatians 2:19; 3:10, 24, 25; Hebrews 7:18, 19. The distinction is that under grace the Holy Spirit produces *in* the Christian that perfect righteousness which the Jew vainly tried to produce in himself by obedience to the commandments (Romans 8:2-4; Galatians 5:22, 23).

In Exodus 4:24 why did the Lord seek to kill Moses?

Moses had failed to observe the ceremony which was the sign of God's covenant in not having his son circumcised (Gen. 17:14) and if he continued in disobedience, must be punished. However, his wife, by her obedience, averted his punishment.

Could Job 2:9 be translated "Bless God, and die"?

The same Hebrew word, *barak,* is translated in the Authorized Version both "bless," and "curse," though not in the sense of execration, as in other Hebrew words translated "curse" (see "Young's Concordance"). In the passages in Job (1:5; 2:5, 9) where *barak* is used, it is obvious that the word "bless" could not apply, but rather "to bid farewell to," as the word "curse" in these cases should be understood to mean.

PARABLES

Why, in the parable of Luke 16, is the unjust steward commended?

The unjust steward was commended for the wisdom he displayed in his forethought in preparing for the future. The children of light may learn a lesson in this respect from the children of the world—not as to their eternal security in Christ, as that is settled the moment they are born again, but as to the laying up of treasure in heaven, —rewards for service, etc.

What lesson is to be learned from the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, the eleventh hour laborers receiving the same as those who worked all day (Matthew 20:1-16)?

The 16th verse seems to give the application, which makes the parable one of salvation rather than of rewards for service, showing that he who hears the Master's call, even at the eleventh hour, has the same access,—the same salvation, as those who hear the call early. That it does not apply to rewards for service we must infer from such passages as 1 Corinthians 3:11-15; Revelation 22:12, etc., where the character of the work is shown to determine the measure of the reward.

In the parable of the Marriage Feast (Matthew 22:1-14) what lesson did Jesus mean to teach?

"Them that were bidden to the wedding and they would not come" were the Jewish nation. The King's servants, the prophets, had been sent forth to call them, and later the apostles—but in vain. The judgment upon their murderous treatment of the King's servants fell in A. D. 70, when Jerusalem was destroyed. The Gentiles were then invited to take the places prepared for Israel. Grace provides a wedding garment for every one invited, and the

man who presumed to appear in the King's presence in his own robes, could be naught but "speechless."

Is there any warrant for saying that the foolish virgins of Matthew 25 are lost?

There is the strongest possible warrant for saying so. The Lord could never say to a justified believer, "I know you not" (verse 12). He could not say it, because it would be false. And not only so, it would contradict His own gracious promises (John 6:37; 10:27-29). The interpretation to the contrary arises, not out of the passage, but out of the hard necessity of those who set out to prove that not all who are Christ's are in the first resurrection—a notion which flatly contradicts 1 Corinthians 15:23 and 1 Thessalonians 4:13, 18.

Would not the reference to leaven in Matthew 13:33, comparing it to the kingdom, prove an exception to the rule in which the word usually refers to something evil?

1. If leaven is used in a good sense in Matthew 13:33 it is the only place in the whole Bible where it is so used. Perhaps no word in the whole symbolism of Scripture has so persistently and repeatedly an evil sense. To the ancient, as to the modern Jew, it meant evil and only evil (see Gen. 19:1-3; Ex. 12:15, 18, 20; Lev. 2:4). To this day the strict Jew makes the search for leaven an essential part of the Passover preparation. It is, therefore, all but inconceivable that our Lord would arbitrarily change to a good sense a word upon which inspiration had for two thousand years been persistently attaching a bad sense.

2. If our Lord *did* thus change the symbolical significance of the word He did it wholly without warning or explanation, and without the use of the accustomed phrase in such cases, "It hath been said unto you by them of old time,—but I say unto you," etc. An orthodox Jewish rabbi

was once asked, "Suppose the Messiah when He comes, speaking to Jews, should compare something concerning His kingdom to leaven, what would they understand Him to mean?" His answer was, "They would understand that evil had crept into the kingdom."

3. But Christ Himself repeatedly used the word in its usual biblical sense of evil (Matt. 16:6; Luke 12:1, etc.), and not only so, but He gave the true typical meaning of the symbol as being defiled *doctrine* (Matt. 16:12). And this, be it observed, later in His ministry than Matthew 13:30.

4. Furthermore, the Apostle Paul uses the word in its usual biblical significance, and no other (1 Cor. 5:6, 7; Gal. 5:9).

5. Nothing, therefore, but invincible necessity can warrant the giving of a wholly contradictory and exceptional sense to the word in Matthew 13:33.

Does such a necessity exist? It is sometimes alleged that it does because "the kingdom of heaven" is likened to leaven. To which the sufficient answer is that the kingdom of heaven in the form described in the parables of Matthew 13 is wholly transitory and exceptional. It is not the form foreseen by the prophets,—the final form when the kingdom shall be set up. It is the form of the kingdom between the first and second advents of the Messiah—between the seed-sowing of the first parable and the net drawing of the last. Thus understood, the word falls into its invariable significance, and teaches that as the kingdom during the interval between the seed sowing and net drawing is defiled by tares ("children of the wicked one") and fish which are "bad" and are "thrown away," so even the wheat ("children of the kingdom") are defiled with evil doctrines. Certainly, that both these forms of defilement exist no one will deny.

THE PERSON AND WORK OF CHRIST

To what extent did Christ become "sin for us" on the cross (2 Cor. 5:21)?

Our sins were borne "in His body," but not in His nature. In that respect He was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners." It was His soul which was made an offering for sin (Isa. 53). That was the real atonement and therefore the sacrifice was both an exterior act—His body broken; and an interior act—His soul offered. But such expressions as "saturated with sin," etc., are unscriptural and coarse.

In what sense does the blood of Christ cleanse repeated sin in the believer's life?

New discoveries of sin in the believer's life do not require new applications of the blood in the sense of salvation. "He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet" (John 13:10), and the cleansing of the Church is "by the washing of water by the Word" (Eph. 5:26), but the place of the believer in the light is kept secure through the shed blood which, so long as the believer sins, "cleanseth him."

What is the difference between conversion and regeneration?

Conversion is the act of man in turning from sin to God through faith in Jesus Christ; regeneration, the response of God to conversion and is "the impartation of a new nature, even God's own nature" (Torrey), through the recreative power of the Spirit (John 3:5, 6; 2 Cor. 5:17, R.V.; 2 Pet. 1:4, R.V.). "Regeneration is God's act; conversion is ours" (Hodge).

What is it to be "born of water and of the Spirit"?

Water in Scripture is a symbol of both the Word and the Spirit (see John 7:38, 39; Eph. 5:26). The Spirit and

the Word together effect the new birth (John 3:5; 1 Pet. 1:23). The Word reveals the truth concerning the salvation that is in Christ, and when that truth is believed, the Spirit regenerates.

Is it correct to say that God imputes righteousness by imparting it?

Such a statement confuses together things which differ; *viz.*, justification and sanctification. The doctrine of Romans 4 is that God reckons or "imputes" to the believer because of his faith—a faith which has Christ for its content—that righteousness which Christ is, and which Christ has wrought. This act of imputation is instantaneous, and changes the believer's standing before God. Imputation is a word of the counting room. The word is used in Paul's direction to Philemon concerning the debts of Onesimus, "put that on mine account." Philemon was to "impute" to Paul the debts of Onesimus. Certainly there was no "impartation." In a word, imputation is immediate and justifies,—impartation is gradual and sanctifies.

How did Christ fulfill His office as prophet?

We must first see what that office involved. The prophets were men raised up mostly outside the priestly or Levitical class in times of apostasy and declension. Their function was, primarily, that of revivalists and patriots, speaking to the national conscience and striving to restore faith in Jehovah, purity of worship, and patriotism among the people. The ministry of Elijah illustrates this. Later in the history of the nation the predictive element became more prominent. Now by referring to Isaiah 61:1, 2, you will see how that passage applies to the prophetic office of Christ (see also Deut. 18:15-19; Acts 3:22).

Can we say that Isaiah 40:11, "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd," etc., is a prophecy of the priestly work of Christ?

Yes. With this passage read Hebrews 13:20, 21. As the *good* Shepherd Christ gave His life for the sheep; as the *great* Shepherd He was "brought again from the dead," to take care of the sheep. It is part of His High Priestly work (see Heb. 7:24, 25). The priests of old were rebuked as faithless shepherds (see *e. g.,* Ezek. 34:1-10). Christ exercised this priest-shepherd office for the believers of this dispensation, but its larger manifestation awaits the kingdom age, when Israel will again be fed on the mountains of Palestine (see Ezek. 34:12-16).

What are the seven compound names by which Jehovah is revealed in redemptive relation to man?

Mere adjectivial descriptions of Jehovah are not names. Such descriptions abound, especially in the Psalms. The Hebrew form alone determines whether the phrase is a name, or a description. The names referred to are seven:

(1) Jehovah-jirah, "the LORD will provide" (Gen. 22:13, 14).

(2) Jehovah-rapha, "the LORD that healeth" (Ex. 15:26).

(3) Jehovah-nissi, "the LORD our banner" (Ex. 17:8-15).

(4) Jehovah-shalom, "the LORD our peace, or the LORD send peace" (Judges 6:24).

(5) Jehovah-ra-ah, "the LORD, my shepherd" (Psalm 23).

(6) Jehovah-tsidkenu, "the LORD our righteousness" (Jer. 23:6).

(7) Jehovah-shammah, "the LORD is present" (Ezek. 48:35).

Are there any Scripture references to justify the teaching that our Lord's body was transformed at His ascension?

There are no such passages. It is an inference from 2 Corinthians 5:1 and 1 Corinthians 15:50. Even then it rests upon a crass misapprehension of the meaning of those passages. The body in which our Lord arose is the resurrection body of 1 Corinthians 15:35-44; having, like the harvest from sown seed, identity of kind and continuity of substance with that which is sown, but purified from "corruption," "dishonor" and "weakness," and made incorrupt, glorious, powerful, and spiritual. In this process of purification and endowment the body becomes neither impalpable nor incorporeal (Luke 24:36-43; John 20:26-28). The account of the ascension in Acts 1:9-11 directly establishes the visibility of the ascension body of our Lord, as also its identity with the body in which He arose from the grave, and the angelic promise of verse 11 assures the permanency of that body.

Why do not the genealogical accounts of Christ in Matthew and Luke agree?

Matthew is the "book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." This book presents the kingly aspect and so His genealogy is traced through the line of Israel's kings, omitting some of his human ancestors which are found in Luke's account. Notice, the words "son of" are supplied. Luke traces his descent through Mary, while Matthew only traces His line through the kings.

Did Christ's temptations cover the same ground as ours?

Yes, "apart from sin" (cf. Heb. 4:15). "Yet without sin" is misleading, implying that He finally overcame. There was no sin in Him to overcome (Luke 1:35). Christ

was in all points tempted like as we are, apart from the inward solicitations to evil which come from the fallen Adamic nature. Christ was perfectly human, but by a new creation—the second man, the "last Adam" (1 Cor. 15:45).

Why is Christ spoken of as the "Son of David"?

Christ is called the "Son of David" not only because lineally descended from David (Luke 3:31), but also because he is the heir of David's kingly rights under the Davidic covenant (2 Sam. 7:12-16; Jer. 23:5-8; Luke 1:26-33; Acts 2:29-32; 15:14-17).

If Christ were divine, how could He understand human nature?

Christ was not only divine, but He was also the only naturally good man the law ever saw. Some object to the thought that He was naturally good, saying, "If we were naturally good we would not sin either; it is no credit to one with no sin in him to be good; how can such an one sympathize with me?" The answer is, The Old Testament sacrifice had to be perfect—without blemish, to answer for a sin offering. Christ, as the sacrifice for sin, had to be entirely without spot and blemish. If He had had a fallen nature—had sin in Him, He would have been one with us in sin and under the curse of the law. I might die for the world, but this would not save the world. The only one who could must be not only sinless as to act, but as to being. As to sympathy, Christ does not sympathize with our sins. He provides a remedy for them, by His perfect sacrifice. We have His sympathy for our trials, sorrows, etc., in His High Priestly work or office.

PRAYER

Is not the Lord's Prayer upon kingdom, rather than Church ground?

It is undeniable that the Lord's Prayer so-called (Disciples' Prayer would be a more accurate designation), is a

prayer upon kingdom rather than upon Church ground. (1) It is not in Christ's name. (2) It makes human forgiveness the ground for expecting divine forgiveness. This is righteousness, not grace. In Ephesians 4:32 the Church ground is stated. The Christian is exhorted to be forgiving, not that he may be forgiven, but because he has been forgiven. The prayer, in these two respects, partakes of the character of the time of our Lord's personal ministry—intermediate between law and grace.

Is the Lord's Prayer one for the believer of this dispensation to offer?

There is no sense in which a believer, since the crucifixion, can pray, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." First, the believer is already forgiven (Eph. 1:7; 4:32; Col. 2:13; 1 John 2:12). Secondly, the measure of the believer's forgiveness is not according to the degree or measure of his forgiveness of his debtors. It was so under law; but under grace the measure of the believer's forgiveness is according to something in God. "The forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace" (Eph. 1:7). "For his name's sake" (1 John 2:12). The other petitions in the Lord's Prayer he may fitly offer.

PROPHETIC

Where in the seal judgment do the events of the seventh chapter of Revelation come, chronologically?

The seventh chapter of Revelation is a parenthesis in the movement of events. With the opening of the sixth seal souls are seen and heard of those who have been martyred under the first five seals. The seventh seal is to introduce the "trumpet" and "woe" judgments of the "great tribulation" (Matt. 24:15-24), and it is most comforting that just here should be the full vision of the saints of the tribulation. But it is not that the one hundred and forty-four thousand out of Israel and the "great multitude that

no man could number" of Gentiles are already in heaven. What John sees is the whole harvest of the great tribulation (see verse 14, R.V.) in full and final blessedness. He then goes on to describe the tribulation in the midst of which they are to be saved.

Does prophecy ever relate to the material universe? And if so, what changes are predicted?

The prophetic Word predicts the disenthrallment of creation from its bondage to corruption and its subjection to "vanity"; that at the glorious appearing of Christ "the mount of Olives shall be cleft in twain"; that during the millennium a river shall flow out from Jerusalem from underneath the altar in the millennial temple; that at the end of the millennium the earth shall be purged with fire, so that there shall be "a new heavens and a new earth" (see Rom. 8:19-22, R.V.; Zech. 14:4; Ezek. 47:1-12; Rev. 21:1).

Is there any truth in the statement that many of the prophetic predictions were made at or nearly at the time of their occurrence?

No, that statement is incorrect. The Septuagint, containing prophecies of Christ, for instance, dates back over 300 years before Christ, so you see this alone would leave 300 years of intermission.

What is the best way to outline the book of Revelation?

The general outline of the Revelation is indicated in the commission given to John to write the book (Rev. 1:19), "Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter" (literally, "after these things," *i. e.*, after "the things which are").

The things which John had seen are, obviously, contained in the first chapter—the Patmos vision of the glorified

Christ in the midst of the candlesticks, or lamp-stands (the churches, 1:20).

Putting ourselves back at the date of Apocalypse, say A. D. 96, and looking about for "things which are," we should at once be attracted by the churches as having for the time taken the witnessing place in the counsels of God formerly held by Israel. Accordingly, we find John next writing about churches. Seven then existing churches in Asia Minor are addressed in messages of like structure but varying content. At this late date there can be no difficulty in interpreting these messages as prophetical—ecclesiastical history written in advance. For, laying these messages by the side of the actual history of the churches, it appears that they have passed through phases of development in precise accord with the sevenfold foreview. Ephesus gives the general state at the close of the apostolic period; Smyrna, the period of the great persecutions down to the conversion of Constantine; Pergamos, the period of declension out of which Thyatira, or the papacy, developed; Sardis, the Protestant Reformation, and Philadelphia or Laodicea phases of Protestantism. Thyatira, or Romanism, and Philadelphia and Laodicea or the last condition of Protestantism, go on to the coming of the Lord. The third general division of the book extends, therefore, from 4:1 to the end, and is made up of prophecies which will be fulfilled after the true Church is caught up and the Laodicean residue spewed out of the mouth of Him whose Name Laodicea has brought into contempt. It is in vain to look into history for the events recorded in the third general division. They may have had shadow and illustrative fulfillments, but the final and real fulfillment waits the departure of the Church.

Please explain "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" in Genesis 3:15.

Genesis 3:15 shows the humanity of Christ in that He

was the "seed of the woman" who bruised Satan's head. This was accomplished through the cross (Heb. 2:14, 15; John 12:31-33), but at the cost of the suffering intimated by the expression, "thou shalt bruise his heel." The final execution of the sentence on Satan awaits the fulfillment of Revelation 20:7-10, but Satan's defeat in the death and resurrection of Christ was the sign of his overthrow. The Southern Confederacy existed for some time after the Battle of Gettysburg, but it was there that the confederacy received its death blow.

What will be the relation of heaven to earth after the millennium, and who will dwell on the new earth?

Heaven and earth are distinguished the one from the other, and the surprising thing is that the divine abiding place is with men, and that these are described as "peoples," which in the Revelation is always an expression relating to earthly conditions. The eternal relation of heaven and earth, is Jacob's ladder vision extended beyond the millennium into eternity. It should be remembered, also, that with a singular persistency, eternal duration is associated with the Davidic covenant (2 Sam. 7:16; Psa. 89:3, 4, 27, 28, 29; Luke 1:33), under which Christ takes His earthly kingship. It is evident from 1 Corinthians 15:24, 28, that the mediatorial work of the King will come to a glorious consummation, but this does not imply a cessation of His kingly rule. The new earth is, then, the abode of "men," of "peoples," and the eternal tabernacle is with them.

When we ask concerning the identity of these eternal earth-dwellers, we come upon one of the reticences of Scripture, and can only say that there is no biblical objection to the inference that they are the "men" and "peoples" of the millennial period of Revelation 21. It certainly is remarkable that we nowhere have revealed the eternal state of the obedient and believing part of the millennial peoples. The part engaged in the rebellion of Revelation 20:7-10 are

"devoured." But what of the millennial "saints" who do not rebel? They are not in the judgment of the great white throne, for only "the dead" are there. If it be asked how the millennial saints could be kept alive during the purgation of the earth by fire (2 Pet. 3:10), one points to the power of God. He who kept alive His three saints in Nebuchadnezzar's furnace is not limited.

According to Matthew 17:10-13, did not Jesus teach that the prophecy concerning Elijah (Mal. 4:5) was fulfilled in John the Baptist?

Malachi 4:5 does not refer to John the Baptist, but to "Elijah the Prophet." The prediction which refers to John the Baptist is in Malachi 3:1, so quoted in Matthew 11:10; Mark 1:2; Luke 7:27. He came before Christ in his character of Angel of the Covenant (Mal. 3:1), and was an Elijah-like man (Luke 1:17; Matt. 11:14). But "Elijah the Prophet" in his own person will come—not before Christ, but "before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (Mal. 4:5). He will do what John did not (see verse 6). All the passages must be construed together. In Matthew 17 Jesus confirms the unfulfilled prophecy concerning Elijah in Malachi 4:5, 6, and yet keeps distinct the prophecy of John the Baptist. John's ministry was so completely in the spirit and power of Elijah that in an adumbrative way it could be said that Elijah had already come.

If "all Israel" is to be saved (Rom. 11:26) what about the Jews who reject Christ now?

The Jews who have died in unbelief will remain in their graves until the great white throne judgment, at the end of the kingdom age (Rev. 20:11). It is nowhere in Scripture intimated that all will accept Christ during the kingdom age. The natural heart will be as prone to evil (the inward evil of the Adamic nature) then as now. Men will

become glory-hardened as they are now gospel-hardened. See the result in Revelation 20:7-9. During this age, only the Jewish remnant will accept Christ, as there is a vail over the heart of the nation, but when Christ returns in glory, Israel will repent and turn to the Lord (see Zech. 12:10).

Why is it necessary to study the prophetic portions of Scripture; is it not more profitable to deal with those portions that treat of salvation?

1. Prophecy came to us "by the will of God" (2 Pet. 1:20, 21) both for our instruction and blessing (Rev. 1:3).

2. We are to "rightly divide the Word of truth." This we cannot do unless we search and study the Scriptures, dividing it as to past, present and future (1 Tim. 2:15).

3. Peter speaks of it as "a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, etc." (2 Pet. 1:19).

4. For ages before the promised "seed" came into the world, the Old Testament saints "enquired and searched diligently" concerning His first coming,—then why should not His saints in this age do the same concerning His second coming—especially as He has stored His Word so full of the hidden gold that needs but to be mined out.

5. As a matter of intelligence we should study prophecy, for it is impossible to understand the times in which we live without this study.

6. As witnesses of Christ, we are giving an imperfect and incomplete testimony if we withhold that concerning Christ's return and earthly reign, which must take place if God would be vindicated as to all the promises of temporal prosperity concerning Israel, and concerning Jesus Himself. Therefore if we close our eyes to that upon which the Author of the book has laid so much importance, and thereby darken the light which He has given to shine

in a dark place (2 Pet. 1:19) and which we should hold up as the Christian's "blessed hope," especially in these last days when the apostasy is making such rapid strides, and the spirit of antichrist so manifest—we shall be unfaithful in our testimony.

Should we expect Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the Lord, according to Malachi 4:5?

That passage does not say that Elijah will come before the Lord comes, but "before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord"—which is a totally different statement. The promise of God by Malachi will be fulfilled, but Christ must Himself come for His Church before the "great and dreadful day of the Lord." That is a distinct epoch in Scripture, the nature and events of which will be clear if we bring together all the passages where the phrase occurs. The order of events is clearly given in 2 Thessalonians 2:1-8: the apostasy of the church, the taking away of the One who hindereth (the Holy Spirit in the Church); the revelation of the son of perdition; and the destruction of the son of perdition by the brightness of the Lord's coming. Elijah's ministry comes between the taking away of the Church and the revelation of the man of sin. His ministry is to Israel exclusively, according to Malachi 4:6. It is referred to in Revelation 11:3-8 (Moses probably being the other "witness"), and the scene of Elijah's ministry in Jerusalem (Rev. 11:8).

Is it not true that premillennialism is essentially pessimistic?

So far from premillennialism being essentially pessimistic, it gives the only solid basis for an invincible and triumphant optimism. Whatever may be the discouraging feature of any time in the "slow procession of the ages," the premillennialist is sure of the final victory. How could it breed pessimism to expect the Lord with all the saints

and the holy angels? The belief that at any moment the series of events may begin which are to culminate in the coming of that tremendous reinforcement to the forces that make for righteousness in this earth is surely a most inspiring belief. Wellington, fighting desperately at Waterloo, did not find the hope of the coming of Blucher casting a gloom over his mind.

Is "Babylon the great," in Revelation 17, Rome?

Babylon the great of Revelation 17 is more than Rome, though it includes Rome. It is apostate Christianity as it will be during the great tribulation after the true Church has been taken away (1 Thess. 4:14-17; Rev. 4:1), and will be headed up in what is left of the papacy.

Why is the name "David" applied to Christ in the prophecies?

In biblical usage, the posterity of a man whom God had made a covenant head takes his name (see *e. g.,* Isa. 40:27; 43:1; Rev. 22:16). The New Testament confirmation of the Davidic covenant makes it clear that this is the sense in which the collective name "David" is used in the Old Testament passages referred to, for in the promise through Gabriel (Luke 1:32, 33), the promise to David is distinctly renewed to Christ, of the city of David.

Do the image vision of Daniel 2 and the beast vision of chapter 7 represent the same thing?

The monarchy-image vision of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 2 and the wild-beast vision of Daniel in Daniel 7 have both resemblances and differences.

They are alike in that both show a succession of four great Gentile world-powers, Babylonia, Medo-Persia, Macedonia (as extended under Alexander) and Rome.

They are alike, again, in that both visions show a process of disintegration of the last of the Gentile world

monarchies, that of Rome. The image vision speaks of two legs and of feet and toes; the wild-beast vision plainly of ten kingdoms in the last form of the fourth, or Roman Gentile world monarchy. They are alike, lastly, in that both show a sudden and catastrophic end of Gentile world sovereignty; and that not by natural, but by supernatural means.

But the differences are as strongly marked as the agreements. The monarchy vision gives the imposing external majesty and grandeur of the world-empires; the beast vision their true inner nature. Past the external glitter, it is seen that all Gentile world dominion is rapacious, bloody, selfish, and founded upon and sustained by force. Everybody knows that the majestic fabric of modern civilization rests, in the last analysis, upon the power of armies and navies.

Again, the monarchy vision reveals the division of the last or Roman world-power and its destruction, but externally, as it were. The beast vision gives the prophetic foreview of the closing events. The monarchy vision is silent as to one of the most important personages of the end time; the beast vision reveals the "little horn" (Paul's "man of sin"; the antichrist of 1 John; the "beast" out of the sea of Revelation) and the outline of his awful career.

But the chapters end alike in a vision of the Messianic earthly kingdom of the "stone cut out without hands"; of the "one like the Son of man."

Is the "little horn" of Daniel 7 identical with the "little horn" of Daniel 8?

No. Note the following contrasts:

1. The "little horn" of chapter 7 comes up among the "ten horns" (which are "ten kings that shall arise," 7:24) into which the fourth, or Roman, world power shall be divided at the end time of the Gentile, or present, age. The "little horn" of chapter 8 comes out of one of the four

kingdoms (the Syrian) into which the third, or Macedonian, world power fell after the death of Alexander the Great. In other words, the "little horn" of chapter 8 runs his course before the fourth (Roman) empire comes to its zenith.

2. The "little horn" of chapter 7 overcomes three of the ten kings. The "little horn" of chapter 8 does nothing like that, nor could he, because the "ten kings" did not exist then. In a word, the "little horn" of chapter 8 has been fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphenes—a shadow and type of the "little horn" of chapter 7 who will run his awful course during the great tribulation.

How do the "beasts" in Revelation 13 correspond with the same personages in Daniel?

Strictly speaking there are three "beasts" in Revelation 13. If you will turn to Daniel 7 you will see that the four successive world-empires which had been revealed to Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 2 as different metals composing one great image, were revealed subsequently to Daniel as four beasts. Note carefully the description of the fourth beast in Daniel's vision (Dan. 7:7, 8, 19-25) and then return to Revelation 13:1, 2, and you will, I think, see that the "beast out of the sea" is, first of all, just Daniel's fourth beast, or the Roman empire in a divided form. But from verses 3-8 it is obvious that the reconstituted empire is represented in a man, the head of civil power at that time (yet future of course), when this prophecy will be fulfilled; and that this man is also called "the beast."

From verse 11 of Revelation 13 we are shown "another beast" who is as obviously ecclesiastical as the beast of verses 3-8 is civil. For light upon the beast of verse 11 we turn to Revelation 19:20, where the description of the "false prophet" identifies him with "the beast" of Revelation 13:11. I answer, therefore, that "the beast out of the sea" of Revelation 13:1, 2 is the revised Roman empire

in the form of ten confederated kingdoms having one imperial head, who is "the beast" of Revelation 13:3-8. And this second beast is the "little horn" of Daniel 7; the "prince that shall come" of Daniel 9:26; the "abomination of desolation" of Matthew 24:15; "that wicked" of 2 Thessalonians 2:8, and "antichrist" of 1 John 2:18. The third "beast" of Revelation 13:18 is the "false prophet" of Revelation 19, and is priest-prophet of the second beast.

Who are the twenty-four elders of Revelation 4?

The "elders" of Revelation 4 stand for the Church. It must always be remembered in interpreting the Revelation that it is a book in which truth is revealed by signs, or symbols. The "elders" are redeemed (verse 9); are royal and priestly (verse 10), and are twenty-four in number, which is significant of priesthood, as David divided the priests into four and twenty courses. In Revelation 1:6 the quality of kingship and function of priesthood are spoken of in connection with the Church. Again, all through the book, it is noticeable that the elders have the secret of things, as *e. g.*, 5:5; 7:13, 14, which accords with John 15:15. The Scriptures give no hint of any other body of saints of whom all these things are true. The "living ones" of Revelation 4:6, etc., seem to be identical with the seraphim and cherubim of the Old Testament.

Who is the "woman" of Revelation 12 and what is the general meaning of that vision?

The structure of Revelation 12 is as follows: The woman is Israel with her twelve-starred crown. The dragon is Satan with the fallen angels. The man-child is Christ, as is evident from verse 5, with Psalms 2 and Revelation 2:27. Verse 6 takes up Israel at the beginning of the great tribulation, persecuted by Satan, but protected and preserved.

The interpretation which makes the Church the woman

is involved at once in the absurdity of making the Church which did not begin till Pentecost, the mother of Christ. No system of interpretation of prophecy is free from difficulties, but these may be overcome by prayerful study, and a resolute determination not to so explain things as to explain them away.

On what grounds is it claimed that we are near the end of the age?

Students of prophecy cannot, as it would seem, but find our times full of signs of the approaching end of the age. The events predicted for the closing of this dispensation are, a great apostasy (2 Thess. 2:3); the revelation of the man of sin, identical with the "little horn" of Daniel 7:8, 24, 25, the antichrist of 1 John 2:18, and the beast of Revelation 13:1-10, and the great tribulation. The tribulation is introduced by anarchy.

Surely, in the widespread disbelief in the Scriptures as inspired of God, and of final authority in the matters of doctrine and practice, and this not by confessed atheists and agnostics, as formerly, but by influential ministers and theological professors, there is a "sign" of apostasy—more accurately, the apostasy begun. The man of sin cannot be revealed till "he that hindereth" be taken out of the way. This is the Holy Spirit in the Church. The apostasy will be followed by the removal of the Church, as described in 1 Thessalonians 4:14-17, after which the man of sin will be revealed, the tribulation will run its course and will be brought to an end by the glorious appearing of the Lord (2 Thess. 2:8; Rev. 19:11-20). An apostate church is then the first sign of the end.

But Israel is also a sign, since the first constructive work of the Lord after His return will be the restoration of the Davidic throne, regathering of Israel (Luke 1:31-33; Acts 15:16, 17). The great Zionistic movement, evincing a

stirring of the hearts of the Jewish people toward their ancient land, is a most significant sign of the end.

Is there any distinction between "the day of the Lord" and "the day of Christ"?

The Scriptures distinguish absolutely between the "day of Christ" and the "day of the Lord." The latter phrase is the older, occurring constantly in the prophets, especially Joel. It is associated with a time of supreme and unexampled trouble for Israel, out of the extremity of which Israel is delivered by the coming of the Lord (see Joel 1:15; 2:11, 30-32; 3:1-16; Zech. 14:1-5; Jer. 30:5-8; Matt. 24:21, 22; 1 Thess. 5:1-3; 2 Pet. 3:10-13; Rev. 19:17-21). The day of Christ, on the contrary, is a New Testament phrase, and is connected with the taking away of the Church, which is the first phase of the second coming of Christ. It is the time, therefore of the Christian's reward (see 1 Thess. 4:13-17).

To what does "the end" in Matthew 24:13, 14 refer?

The "end" referred to is the end of the present age or dispensation. The word rendered "world" in verse 3 should be "age," or "ages." The "end of the world" is not in view here. Scripturally, the world (earth) has no end. Purged by fire (2 Pet. 3:10-13) it becomes "the new earth" (Rev. 21:1).

What scriptural reason can you give against the post-millennial teaching?

The divine program, Acts 15:14-17, puts the re-establishment of David's throne after the return. The divine program, Revelation 19-20, puts the kingdom after the resurrection of the "holy," and that is "at His coming." The divine program, Matthew 25, puts the "throne" after His return. The divine program, Romans 11, puts the coming

after the fullness of the Gentiles. The divine program, Matthew 13, excludes the possibility of a millennium during this age. The divine program, Daniel 2, puts the kingdom of the heavens after the destruction of the present political world-system. The divine program for the kingdom, Isaiah 11; Deuteronomy 30, etc., requires the restoration of Israel as the initial fact and that follows the return, Deuteronomy 30:3.

Who is meant by "the man who is my fellow" in Zechariah 13:7?

The "shepherd" who was smitten, God here calls His "fellow," or equal. According to Philippians 2:6, Christ did not look upon His equality with God in "form" (*i. e.*, visible glory) as "a thing to be grasped" (held fast), but emptied Himself of that form in becoming incarnate in the Babe of Bethlehem. He was in the mystery of the Trinity, eternally Jehovah's "fellow"; in incarnation He became the Shepherd that He might be "smitten" for the sins of the "flock."

THE RAPTURE

Is it unscriptural to teach a partial rapture—that only sanctified believers are to be caught up when the Lord comes? Philippians 3:11, 12, would seem to bear out this conclusion.

That teaching is a fundamental error of far-reaching consequences. That it rests upon but few texts which apparently teach it, is of course evident even to its most convinced advocates. First, in Hebrews sanctification is always positional—objective, not subjective. "Sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (10:10).

Second, in Philippians 3 the apostle is speaking of his past experience down to the end of the first clause of verse 12. He puts himself back into his legal and Jewish

frame at verse 4, and then shows us his frame when all his painfully acquired righteousness fell in ruins on the Damascus road, and there was born in his heart the longing for:

(a) "The righteousness of God."

(b) The acquaintanceship with Christ.

(c) The fellowship of his sufferings (as Stephen, for example).

(d) The present realization of union in His death.

(e) The share in the out-resurrection.

That Paul uses the present tense is nothing to the purpose, for it is his way. He does the same thing in Romans 7:14-20, but no one supposes that Paul, when writing Romans, was in a seventh-of-Romans experience.

The notion of a partial rapture of Christians based upon subjective sanctification or belief in the second coming, or what not, explicitly contradicts 1 Corinthians 15:22, 23 and 1 Thessalonians 4:14-18, where the subject is not inferentially before the mind of the Spirit, but directly before His mind. Furthermore, it violates that unity of the body which is one of the tremendously emphatic doctrines concerning the Church; it completely spoils grace by insinuating that any mortal could be worthy of such a boon; and it imports into theology the notion of purgatorial cleansing in the tribulation fires, of those who already are "whiter than snow" in the divine sight because blood-cleansed.

Are all Christians to be caught up to meet the Lord at His coming or only those who are entirely sanctified?

There are no Christians who are not "entirely sanctified" (Heb. 10:10): "By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (1 Cor. 6:11): "And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

In the sense of sinless perfection none is "sanctified" (1 John 1:8, 10; James 2:10; 1 Tim. 1:15).

The true distinction is not as between sanctified and unsanctified Christians, but as between "carnal" and "spiritual" (1 Cor. 2:15; 3:1).

But these distinctions of spirituality or sanctification have nothing to do with qualification for the first resurrection or the rapture of the Church. The promise is to all who are Christ's (1 Cor. 15:22, 23; 1 Thess. 4:16, 17). It is *faith,* not attainments subsequently to faith, which makes us Christ's (Heb. 11:5, 6).

Where is the Holy Spirit after the rapture?

The Holy Spirit in the Church goes with the Church to meet Christ in the air, but the Church, we must remember, does not contain the entire third person of the Trinity. Christ is in us, for example, by His life, but Christ is living in the plentitude of divine life and constantly imparting new life to new believers; so while the Holy Spirit does not leave the Church, He still fills all space and the world will never be left without Him. The power of the Spirit, in other words, will accompany the tribulation preaching. Without Him, regeneration on the earth would be impossible.

On what scriptural grounds can we state that the great tribulation follows and does not precede the rapture?

1. Matthew 24:37-39 predicts the failure of the dispensation of grace not only in the unpreparedness of the people, but in their utter godlessness, as in the days before the Flood—concerned only with the things of this life, with no thought or concern for God or His kingdom.

2. We know that the great tribulation follows the descent of the Lord to receive the sleeping and living saints in the air, from the order in which these events are taken up in

the Scriptures, in which truth is always progressive. In 1 Thessalonians 4 we have the rapture of the saints in the first resurrection; then follows, in the fifth chapter, the "day of the Lord," beginning in judgment. Paul tells the believers, in the fourth chapter, that this day will not overtake them, for, says he (verse 9), "God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ." This was to be their *comfort* (4:18; 5:11). There would be but little comfort in the thought of their having to go through the coming tribulation. Again, in Revelation 3:10, the promise to the church of Philadelphia, representing, historically, the godly remnant in this age, the promise is that they are to be kept *from* (not *in*) "the hour of testing which shall come upon all the world to try them that dwell upon the earth." Now, if they are to be kept from it, they must necessarily have been taken out of the way previous to this time of tribulation or testing.

Again, in the fourth chapter of Revelation we see the Church, represented by the "four and twenty elders" in heaven, ready to witness the judgments which are about to fall upon the earth.

These scriptures all indicate most clearly that the great tribulation follows and does not precede the first resurrection, and the rapture.

RATIONALISM

What is the difference between the positions of Harnack and Ritschl?

Harnack is doubtless the foremost patristic scholar living, nor is he surpassed as an authority in the history of dogma. But his point of view is thoroughly antisupernatural, and his conclusions are therefore often valueless to the man of faith. As a mine of fact, and as the product of vast learning, adequate historical imagination, and uncommon charm of style (even in translation) his "History of Dogma" is invaluable.

This cannot be said of his latest book on Christianity. Here, without ceasing to be the historian, he is yet far more the controversialist, and his conclusions are therefore colored by his materialistic point of view. He leaves very little of Christianity.

It is difficult to define Ritschlianism because Ritschlianism is not, in the ordinary sense, a system. It has no "points" like Calvinism, nor even a core of doctrine, with liberty concerning inferential doctrines, like the Medium Theology. In a word Ritschlianism is the religious "zeitgiest." It represents the formlessness which is the present characteristic of religious thought in Germany, and therefore appeals to minds strongly impressed with the results of German criticism; who believe the old theology to be in ruins, but are not yet prepared to reconstruct theology on the basis (if it can be called basis) of what is left. Ritschl gives relief to such minds (and they are many) by his device of divorcing religion, by which he means all that the older thinkers called piety, from dogma. He contends that we may go on being good Christians, worshipping God and enjoying communion with Him, without any system of belief whatever.

Ritschl was admirably qualified to frame a theology for this present time of unrest, for he gathered into his own experience every phase of it. Beginning at Bonn under Nitzsch, he soon declared him "shallow when hard pressed," and removing to Halle, came under Tholuck's influence. He judged Tholuck to "lack foundation," and, after six months at Heidelberg under Rothe, he went to Tubingen where Baur was then at the zenith of his peculiar reputation.

Into the worst excesses of the destructive criticism Ritschl at once entered. At last his enthusiasm was aroused. But, as with Nitzsch, Tholuck and Rothe, Ritschl's powerful understanding soon began to react—his

judicial poise probably finding offence in the very riot of destruction which he saw around him.

Becoming himself a professor of theology at Gottingen, he was, both by office and inclination, impelled to fashion a theology; and, of necessity, there entered into it somewhat of all the systems and critical influences which had so variously shaped the man.

Tested at vital points, the extreme variance of Ritschl from historic and confessional Christianity is easily seen. In his doctrine of the person of Christ he utterly rejects the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, with its corollary, the incarnation of the Eternal Son—not only rejects, but heaps scorn upon it. Christ is simply the Revealer of God, and King over a spiritual kingdom. Here enters his peculiar idea of "values." Christ is not God, was not pre-existent, but has "the religious value of God." He rejects, also, the idea of sin as guilt, except as we impute it to ourselves as guilt. The idea of reward and punishment as divine disciplines are excluded, as is also retribution in any sense. He rejects original or inherited sin, and the universality of sin is to be accounted for as the result of ignorance. As for redemption, Christ's death removes the distrust of God which the sinner's bad conscience gives him. The extreme difficulty, however, of defining the Ritschlian position on the doctrines, arises from the habit of the Ritschlians of using all the great words of Scripture and of theology while emptying them of their accepted sense. And herein lies the peculiar danger of Ritschlianism. Deceived by finding the Ritschlians to use the familiar words, the unlearned and unstable suppose all to be right.

For an affectionate and sympathetic book on Ritschlianism see "Reconstruction in Theology," by Prof. King of Oberlin. For a remarkably able, fair, but judicial view, "The Ritschlian Theology," by Prof. Orr of Edinburgh.

The ultimate basis of authority is the Christ revealed

to us in Scripture, a revelation confirmed to the universal church by the experience of 1900 years. As Bushnell long ago showed, in a book never answered, Christ cannot be accounted for on natural grounds, nor upon any grounds other than those stated by Himself. He could not have been invented by the apostles, for human genius has never invented a perfect character. He was not the product of evolution, for evolution produces species, and Christ remains unique.

Christ once established as the basis of authority, a coauthority is found in the Scriptures, for we find our authoritative Christ in them, and He, in turn, authenticates them to us by word and example.

REPENTANCE

What is repentance?

Repentance is a change of mind followed by corresponding action. Matthew 21:28-30 is a perfect illustration of repentance. In the repentance of a saint, sorrow is mingled; indeed, it is godly sorrow which produces his repentance (2 Cor. 7:9, 10). The word used by Paul in verse 8 should be translated "regret" not repent.

RESURRECTION

What place in the resurrection do the Old Testament saints hold?

The Old Testament saints are Christ's, as truly as are the New Testament saints, having been redeemed and saved through His prospective atonement, and as 1 Corinthians 15:23 tells us, "Afterward, they that are Christ's at his coming" shall be there. The Old Testament saints come into no judgment for works, since no heavenly rewards were promised them. Their promises were earthly (see Deut. 28:1-14; Gen. 13:14-17, etc.). The tribulation saints, however, are probably rewarded, though this is not clear.

Is the same resurrection referred to in 1 Thessalonians 4:16 and Revelation 20:4?

Not precisely, though both together constitute "the first resurrection." 1 Thessalonians 4:16 describes the resurrection of all who are Christ's up to the moment of the rapture; Revelation 20:4, the resurrection of the tribulation saints, but both are included in Revelation 20:4-6, though the first sentence in verse 5 is a parenthesis, the last sentence belonging with verse 4.

Is the awakening to "everlasting life" and "contempt" in Daniel 12:2 another phase of Ezekiel's prophecy concerning the valley of dry bones in chapter 37?

These awakenings in Daniel are resurrections, grouped as in John 5:29, the millennium intervening. They who are "unto life" will be in the first resurrection; they who are unto "shame," etc., in the second.

That Ezekiel speaks of the regathering as a resurrection is true, but the context in Ezekiel 37 is wholly different from that of Daniel 12:2.

Does the resurrection in 1 Thessalonians 4:14-17 include only the saved of this dispensation, and if so, is there any difference between those who are "in Christ" (1 Thessalonians 4:16) and they who "are Christ's" (1 Corinthians 15:23)?

Yes, 1 Thessalonians 4:14-17 teaches that all the saved of this dispensation will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air at His coming. 1 Corinthians 15:22, 23 is more general. It teaches (1) that all the dead will be raised; (2) that "they that are Christ's" will be raised at His coming. And this second statement includes all the saved of all dispensations, from Adam to Christ. The Thessalonian passage alone would prove only the resurrection of the Church, "the dead in Christ." "In Christ," or "in

Christ Jesus" is a different expression both in form and meaning, from "they that are Christ's." All of the redeemed are "Christ's"; only those who "by one Spirit" have been "baptized into one body" (1 Cor. 12:13) are "*in* Christ." But all the saved at and since Pentecost *are* baptized into Christ.

Does Paul teach in 1 Corinthians 15:37-44 that the resurrection bodies have varying degrees of glory?

We do not understand it so. His argument is to establish the reasonableness of a vast distinction between the glory of the body that is "sown" and of that body as it will be raised. He appeals to nature. "All flesh is not the same flesh; but there is one flesh of men, and another flesh of beasts," etc. So, too, of "bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial," etc. What wonder then that a body which is sown in corruption, dishonor and weakness should be raised incorrupt, glorious and powerful?

When will the righteous dead of the ages before Christ be raised?

Some of them have been raised already (Matt. 17:3; Jude 9; Matt. 27:52, 53), the rest will be raised when Christ comes into the air (1 Cor. 15:22, 23; 1 Thess. 4: 14-18).

THE SABBATH

What did John mean by "the Lord's day" in Revelation 1:10?

The first day of the week, not "the day of the Lord," or the great tribulation. In chapter 1 John has no vision of the day of the Lord, but of Christ among the churches. The day of the Lord follows the apostasy of the churches, and the taking away of the Church. John's subsequent Patmos visions take in the day of the Lord.

What is the scriptural teaching concerning the Sabbath?

Two kinds of Sabbaths have been known among men. There is, first of all, God's Sabbath, the seventh day. God "blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it," when He had finished His creation work; but the Sabbath was not given to man till twenty-five hundred years after creation (Ex. 20:8-10; Neh. 9:13, 14). This Sabbath, the true biblical Sabbath, was simply and only a day of rest. The word means "cessation." It was not a day of religious observance, except when it coincided with the annual feasts, and even then its character of rest from toil was preserved. This Sabbath was "made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." It was the day when the weary beast and the weary slave, alike with man, shared God's rest. Not one line of Old Testament Scripture associated it with temple-going, or other religious observance.

Then, secondly, the New Testament (in the Gospels) shows us a perverted Sabbath. The synagogue, an institution unknown to Revelation, had been set up by men after the captivities, and in connection with the synagogue the scribes and Pharisees had turned God's sweet day of "cessation," when families and neighbors might have time for innocent social intercourse, into a stern, hard, ritual day, hedged with requirements and limitations utterly foreign to God's Word. Against this Pharisaic Sabbath Christ set Himself. In the judgment of the most religious men of His day He, the Lord of the Sabbath, was accounted a Sabbath breaker!

This perverted Sabbath came into observance again under the Puritans, who made it even sterner, sadder, more forbidding and burdensome than the Pharisaic Sabbath had been. Unfortunately, the divines of the Protestant reformation followed Rome in confusing together the two wholly different days; the Jewish Sabbath which is, always

was, and always must be the seventh day, and the Christian Lord's day—the hybrid receiving the name of the "Christian Sabbath," a designation as self-contradictory as it would be to speak of "the Jewish Lord's day." They are alike in but one respect—they both hallow one-seventh of the time.

The Puritan "Sabbath" was a yoke too hard to be borne by any except stern fanatics and resulted by inevitable reaction in the present Sunday desecration. The only hope of the recovery of the first day to sacred uses is to teach its true character and this is illustrated in the use of our Lord made of the first Christian Lord's day. He comforted weeping Mary; walked seven miles with two perplexed disciples, giving a Bible reading by the way; sent messages to other disciples; had a private interview with backslidden Peter, and imparted the Holy Spirit to the men in the upper chamber.

In other words, the Lord's day is a day of holy activity in resurrection joy and power. The best work on this important subject is Dr. R. A. Torrey's booklet, "Ought Christians to Keep the Sabbath?"

Why do not Christians keep the Sabbath?

Because the Sabbath belongs to the system of law, while Christians of this dispensation are not under the law, but under grace. The Sabbath in which Jesus lay in the tomb marked not only His death and burial, but the death and burial of the whole Mosaic economy, including the Sabbath. The new day that followed marked not only the new life and resurrection of the Son of God, but the bringing into life of a new era for the race. How fitting, then, that we, as members of the new covenant, should keep the first day of the week as a glad day of privilege and communion rather than as one of legal observances! There was an old Sythian custom to carry a corpse around among its friends dressed up in its best attire, feasting over it,

etc. But, after all, it was but a corpse. So with the legal Sabbath.

If Adam, before the law, kept the Sabbath, is it correct to speak of it as a Jewish institution?

There is not only no scriptural evidence that God made known the Sabbath to Adam, but there is direct evidence that not until the Exodus did He "make known His Sabbaths," etc. Assuming, however, that Adam had and observed the Sabbath of the Decalogue, I should say that if he had never fallen he would be observing the seventh day in Eden now.

Does not the fact that the commandment concerning the Sabbath is not mentioned in the New Testament show that it was to remain unchanged?

1. It is a significant fact that every one of the commandments contained in the moral law is mentioned in some way in the New Testament except that of the Sabbath, and upon that subject Paul, through the Spirit, says, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, . . . or of the Sabbath days." Therefore it is for every believer to settle for himself with God as to the setting apart of special time for service and worship. The first day, rather than the seventh, of course, is the day set apart by believers of this age as the Lord's resurrection day (see Lev. 23:10, 11, 16), but even as to this observance we may not judge another. Keeping either the Lord's day or the Sabbath is certainly not a requirement for salvation, nor the failure to observe either a proof that one is not saved. It is rather a question of the life after one has been saved and must be settled with the Lord, according to the light given.

2. As believers in this age we are not under the law, which Paul tells us (Gal. 3:24) was our schoolmaster to lead us to Christ, but we now live by the outworking,

through the Spirit, of that new life which God has put within us through the new birth. That new life, instead of being governed by rules and regulations, as under the law,—is the spontaneous outflow of love, and so living, we are fulfilling the law in all its righteousness, for Paul tells us that he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law, and that because love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law (Rom. 13:8, 10; Gal. 5:14; see also John 15:10-12). Jesus kept His Father's commandments—He fulfilled the law (Rom. 10:4), thus setting us free to live under His new commandment of love by the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:2, 3, 4). The commandment is love; the enabling is the Spirit.

SALVATION

What is life eternal—a term expressing quality or duration?

"Life eternal," as that phrase is used in Scripture, is not the equivalent of "immortality" or unending duration of being. Eternal life is a phrase of quality of life, rather than of duration merely. It is Christ's own life, and only he who has the Son has His life (1 John 5:11, 12; John 3:36).

How can we explain the fact that in the early part of our Lord's ministry and also in the preaching immediately following Pentecost, repentance is emphasized as a condition of salvation, while in the later ministry of the apostles, the emphasis is upon faith?

There is no conflict between the testimony of Christ and of His apostles concerning the conditions of salvation (cf. John 3:36 with Acts 16:31). The preaching from Acts 2 to 9 inclusive is wholly to Jews, and to that generation of Jews which had seen, heard and rejected Messiah. They, unlike Gentiles (Eph. 2:11, 12), were already in covenant relations to Jehovah. The specific charge against them

was: "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Convicted of this specific act they said: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The answer was, "Repent" (*metanoesate*—"change your minds"), etc. It was not faith in *a* Messiah which they lacked, but faith in *the* Messiah, whom they had adjudged an imposter and blasphemer. As Meyer says: "*Metanoesate* demands the change of ethical attitude as the moral condition of being baptized, which directly and necessarily supposes faith" (Mark 1:15).

Was the prize mentioned in Philippians 3:14 eternal life?

The prize Paul was seeking was not at all salvation. *That* he always had (1 Cor. 1:18; 2 Tim. 1:9; Heb. 7:25, etc.). The prize he is striving for is the reward spoken of in Revelation 22:12; 11:18.

If the heathen live up to the light they have, never having heard the gospel, is there any hope for them?

Romans 1:20 reveals the Creator's path to Himself for those outside the gospel limits—those whom the gospel has not reached. If such will follow *that* light, they will find their way to God. In other words, the judgment for the heathen who have never heard the gospel will probably be based on creation testimony and natural conscience (Rom. 2:14, 15).

SANCTIFICATION

Is there any distinction in Scripture between "flesh" and "sin" and "the old man"? If so, please explain.

1. "Flesh" is a word of various meanings in Scripture. Sometimes it means literal flesh, the soft parts of the bodies of men or animals, as in Genesis 17:13; Leviticus 7:20; sometimes the natural body, as in Hebrews 5:7; 2

John 7; sometimes all humanity, as in Genesis 6:12; Luke 3:6; sometimes the sinless humanity of Christ offered as a sacrifice and received by faith, as in John 6:53, 54; but these and other various meanings, are easily determined by the context.

The real difficulty arises when Scripture uses the word in its ethical sense as in Galatians 5:16, 17, and generally in Paul's writings. So used, the definitions, in view of all the passages where "flesh" occurs in the bad ethical sense, must include the body. The definition suggested and with which one may justly find fault, *viz.*, that "flesh is the inborn evil tendency in man," is too restricted. The "flesh" when used ethically, is the whole natural or unregenerate man, spirit, soul and body. The evil sense of "flesh" Paul finds to be a law in his members (Rom. 7:23). It is because the body is a seat and source of sin, and associated with "flesh" that the Holy Spirit indwells the believer to give power over "the flesh" (Gal. 5:16, 17).

2. The root error of eradicationism of the flesh has room to grow only in the false conception of "flesh," as a mere tendency to evil quite apart from the natural body. The biblical doctrine of the body is quite simple. In the unregenerate man it is part of "the flesh"; "sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), literally "flesh of sin," in the likeness of which Christ was made—though, of course, Himself wholly without sin. The body of the believer is identically the same body. It is the "body of his humiliation" (Phil. 3:20); he must beat it and keep it under (1 Cor. 9:27); in it he groans because of it (Rom. 8:23; 2 Cor. 5:2); it is a seat and source of sin (Rom. 7:23); and corrupt, dishonorable, weak, and "natural" (psychical) (1 Cor. 15:42-44). But this body is destined to be fashioned like the glorious body of Christ, in incorruption, glory and power, no longer a psychical or "natural" body as now, but then a pneumatical or "spiritual" body. This change, whether of living or sleeping saints, awaits the return of Christ (Phil. 3:20;

1 Cor. 15:42-44, 51, 52; 1 Thess. 4:13-18), and is called "the redemption of the body" (Rom. 8:23).

The earnest of this coming redemption of the body is the indwelling Spirit (Eph. 1:13, 14; 4:30); whose presence makes even the present body to be, in wonderful grace, a temple (1 Cor. 6:19). So indwelling the body of our humiliation (Phil. 1:20, R.V.), the Spirit lusts against the flesh, and the flesh against the Spirit—which could not be if the flesh were eradicated—and gives victory over the flesh to the believer who walks in the Spirit and not in the flesh (Gal. 5:16, 17).

3. The "old man" is a biblical phrase occurring three times in Scripture (Rom. 6:6; Eph. 4:22; Col. 3:9). The first of these passages gives no clue to a definition, simply asserting the co-crucifixion of our "old man" with Christ. But the Ephesian passage brings the needed light. The "old man" is put in contrast with the "new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," and can mean none other than "Christ in you" (Col. 1:27). The contrast is of origins. The "new man" is a creation from God, "born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1:12, 13). The old man is the precise contrast of this, because born of and after Adam the head of the old creation (1 Cor. 15: 45-47). Accordingly, "the old man" must be defined as human or Adamic nature; the proneness to sin common to all Adam's descendants.

4. The word "sin" as used in Romans 5:21; 6:2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14; 7:5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 20, refers to what in the three passages quoted is called "the old man." The only distinction is that "sin" speaks of the moral quality of mere human nature; the "old man" of the origin of human nature in the Adamic "first man."

What is the distinction between the eradication theory and the Keswick teaching?

The "eradication" theory is the teaching that by some experience it is possible for the Christian to be wholly and forever delivered from the flesh by eradication. The Keswick teaching is that a Spirit-filled believer may walk in unbroken victory over the flesh and over all *known* sin.

Sanctification, in Scripture, is three-fold: (1) At the instant of believing the Christian is "sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ, once for all" (Heb. 10:10, 14); (2) the believer is being sanctified through the application, by the Spirit, to his life of the Word of God (John 17:17; Eph. 5:25, 26); (3) the believer will be entirely sanctified in the sense of sinless perfection at the appearing of Christ (1 John 3:2; Eph. 5:27). This expectation in itself makes for holiness (1 John 3:3). The notion of sinless perfection in this life is unscriptural and dangerous. There is but one perfect man in Scripture—the Man of Calvary; nor has any one ever met a sinlessly perfect human save Him.

But the other notion, that because absolute moral perfection will not be attained in this life, therefore the Christian is excusable for sinning, is monstrous.

Does not the New Testament teach sinless perfection here and now?

Neither Scripture nor experience teach that sinless perfection is possible in this life. It is true that a fountain cannot send forth both sweet and bitter water, and a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, but James uses these illustrations to teach the necessity of yieldedness to the new nature in us. When so yielded, the water will be sweet and the fruit good,—but alas, we are not always yielded.

As to the passages in 1 John, it is exceedingly important to know that John habitually deals with the Christian as a Son of God in an abstract and absolute way, rather than as compassed with infirmity and still bearing about the

old nature. He does not indeed ignore the "old man," but is not occupied with him. In this is the reconciliation of the apparent contradiction of 1:8 and 3:9. The old nature is sin, and we "deceive ourselves" if we suppose sin to be entirely eradicated. The new nature is the "seed of God," and as born again, the believer cannot sin —his new nature cannot sin. Those who teach eradication have very little conception of what sin is: "Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of the law of God." Aside from wilful transgression, whoever, with this conception of sin, lives even a single day in perfect conformity to the law of God? This doctrine of eradication also breeds one of the most heinous of sins, according to God's Word,—self-righteousness. Indeed, the nearer one lives to God, the more is he conscious of falling short of God's holy standard. We may, praise God, live in victory over known sin, and even have particular sins removed out of the life, but new provocations and new circumstances continually bring to light new sins that perhaps we were not even conscious of, and in shame and sorrow we must confess and have them again put away by the blood of Jesus. It is true indeed that some live in greater victory than others, and again, that we are to reckon ourselves "dead unto sin and alive unto God"; that is the attitude we are to take continually. The fact has been accomplished by the death of Christ, and when we see Christ and are "like Him" the fact and the experience will agree. Until then, we shall be hindered in our growth upward by the "bondage of corruption" (Rom. 8:21). When transformed at the coming of Christ, we shall be delivered from that bondage and brought into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

What proofs can be given that the man in Romans 7 is a regenerated man?

The proofs that the man in Romans 7 is a "born-again"

man are: (1) Experiential part starts from "dead to sin" and "married to another"; (2) The man (Paul) has two "I's"; (3) He speaks of the "inner man," which is Paul's phrase for the "new man" (2 Cor. 4:16); and he delights (4) in the law of God, which no unrenewed man ever did.

If sinless perfection is not taught in Scripture, how would you explain 1 Thessalonians 5:23,—"The very God of peace sanctify you wholly"?

It is explained by the context. The "spirit, soul and body" may be "preserved blameless"—which is not sinless perfection, but being kept from stumbling (Jude 24) —while the consummation in the sense of "wholly"—or sinless perfection—is not until "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Not until "he shall appear" shall we be like Him (1 John 3:1-3), and nothing short of perfect Christliness is "sanctified wholly." The will of God is our entire sanctification. When a sinner believes on the Lord Jesus Christ he is *positionally* sanctified "by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. 10:10). Then begin the processes by which his state is made one with his standing. The culmination of these processes (see 2 Cor. 3:18, and like passages) is the beatific vision when he sees Christ "as he is," and is made "like him." To say that the will of God is our sanctification or that we are to be perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect, is by no means to say that we are to become instantaneously perfect.

It should be added, however, that the believer's imperfect state is no excuse for living in known sin. The Spirit-filled believer, though most imperfect in himself, has victory over his imperfection through the Spirit.

SATAN

Is the "bottomless pit" in Revelation 9:11, hell, and does this passage teach that Satan is king of hell?

Under the name of Abaddon, Satan is spoken of as king

of the demons who are to be set loose during the tribulation to torment unbelievers on the earth. But the "bottomless pit" or abyss is not hell in the sense of the lake of fire, or of the place of the final punishment of Satan and the ungodly; it is the equivalent of space merely. In the lake of fire Satan is tormented day and night forever (Rev. 20:10). It may very well be that a large element in his torment is his dethronement.

Was the "dragon" in Revelation 12:4, Herod?

This passage pictures, not Herod waiting to devour the "man-child," but the dragon (Satan) himself behind Herod, who began waiting from the time of his curse (Gen. 3:15) to "devour her child" who should "bruise his head."

What was the character of the serpent before the Fall?

We get no idea from the appearance of the serpent under the curse of the appearance of the serpent before the curse. Ruskin points out that from the traces of beauty remaining—"a serpent cannot make an ungraceful movement," etc.—we may well believe its pristine loveliness to have been marvelous. That a beast should speak is no marvel. Comparatively stupid creatures, as the parrot, learn to speak. It should be no wonder that the most subtle of all the beasts should speak. Unfallen, the serpent was a fit instrument for Satan's use. The old pictures representing a writhing snake at Eve's ear are absurd. In the serpent Satan first appeared "as an angel of light" (2 Cor. 11:14).

SCIENCE AND THE BIBLE

When they teach in college that science does not agree with the Bible, what can we say in reply?

It must be remembered that there are wide differences among great scientists as to the facts of nature, and the

theories are constantly changing, so that such a statement is illogical. Our greatest Christian scientists claim that the Bible is not antagonistic to true science nor true science to the Bible. When we know science in its fulness then only can we see the wonderful harmony in God's Word and the laws of nature. It must be remembered, however, that the Bible is not a scientific treatise. It is not concerned with proving its statements harmoniously with the discoveries of scientists, but to point the way to God.

Does not geology disprove the Bible account of creation?

Enough time is allowed between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 for all the geologic ages. The first creative act refers to the dateless past, and while a catastrophic judgment overthrew the primitive order, and all animal life perished, the traces of which remain as fossils, there is no conflict with the Word of God and geology, as the judgment upon that early creation need not affect that branch of science. Read Pember's "Earth's Earliest Ages."

Does not science disprove the teaching that the rainbow was introduced after the Flood?

Undoubtedly the rainbow had appeared before the time of the Flood, but now Jehovah has given it a new meaning —it is to be the token of His covenant with Noah.

Is Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" a good book to use in teaching the Scriptures?

No. We are not called upon to harmonize science with the Word of God. The conclusions of science are ever changing, and in spite of this, the immutable laws of God are ever vindicating themselves. Drummond's purpose was doubtless a good one, but many of his conclusions were purely speculative and therefore unreliable in teaching truth. We have but one authority for the truth, and we

need not be afraid of God's Word as it stands, whether we can see the harmony between it and nature or not. The harmony is there—time will reveal it.

George Adam Smith, the closest personal friend of Drummond, states in his life of Drummond that before his death he expressed regret for the publication of that book. If the author himself, in the presence of death, repudiated these teachings, we may be satisfied that they contain error. In fact, the book exactly reverses the Bible order: it is not natural law in the spiritual world, but spiritual law in the natural world. That is God's order.

How could there "be light" (Gen. 1:3) before the sun was created?

To understand the first chapter of Genesis, it is necessary to bear in mind that verse 1 gives the fact of the original creation of the heavens and the earth. Between verses 1 and 2 there occurred, as is evident from Jeremiah 4:23-26; Isaiah 24:1; 45:18, the judgment upon the primitive creation which left it "without form and void." In other words, chaos. In the verses which follow we have an account of the action of God in setting that chaos in order again to prepare it for the habitation of man. The work of the first day was to restore light to this chaos. The sun and moon had of course existed from the time of the primitive creation, but masses of vapor would hide the direct rays of the sun, and yet permit a diffused light. This phenomenon is of constant occurrence. We have many days when the sun does not appear at all and yet there is light. Precisely that condition was brought to pass on the first day. Later we have the statement that God made two great lights, etc. The word "made" there is not the Hebrew word for creation, but signifies rather the function of these lights, the work for which they were created, than their creation itself. This is included in the first verse—"God created the heavens and the earth,"

the heavens, of course, implying the heavenly bodies. In verses 14-18 we have a statement of what they were created for.

THE SIN QUESTION

Were the disciples given power to absolve sins, otherwise what is meant in John 20:23:—"Whosesoever sins ye remit; they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained"?

(1) The means by which sins are remitted is faith in the sacrificial work of the Lord Jesus Christ (John 3:14-18; John 1:12; Acts 16:31; 1 Cor. 15:1-4). Instrumentally, this saving truth was committed to the church to be preached in all the world to every creature; (2) There is no other way by which sinful humanity can be saved; (3) Any failure on the part of the church to carry out this trust leaves sinners without a knowledge of salvation. The best inspired interpretation of our Lord's meaning in this passage is in Romans 10:11-17. In other words, it is as if our Lord said, "Now I have committed unto you the way of salvation for the remission of sins. Pass it on, otherwise men will remain in their sins, and you will be responsible."

Does 2 Corinthians 5:21, "made him to be sin," justify the thought that Christ was "blackened with imputed sin"?

The Authorized Version rendering of 2 Corinthians 5:21, "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," gives the sense of the original more clearly than the Revised Version, but neither the original nor the English translation warrant the use of such expressions as you quote: "Blackened with imputed sin," etc. These are the rhetorical extravagances of the earlier theological controversialists. The inspired language concerning the

vicarious sacrifice is always most restrained and reverent. "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all" (lit. "Jehovah hath caused all our iniquities to meet on himself." Isaiah 53:6); "For this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matthew 26:28; "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." 1 Peter 2:24; "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." 1 Peter 3:18.

What does it mean to "sin wilfully" (Hebrews 10:26)?

Sinning wilfully is the conscious doing of a forbidden act. Hebrews 10:26 might be paraphrased, "For, if we consciously do a forbidden act after that we have received the knowledge of the truth (that the sacrifice of Christ has "taken away" the efficacy of the Old Testament sacrifices) there remaineth no other (the former resource for a sinning Hebrew, that is, the old Levitical sacrifice) sacrifice for sin; it is now Christ, or judgment.

Does carnality apply to Christians?

Yes, there are many saved yet carnal believers (see 1 Cor. 3:1). These Corinthians were carnal, but nevertheless they were "in Christ," though babes—undeveloped. In fact, none of us but sometimes give evidence of carnality —sometimes puffed up with success, cast down with failure, contentious, easily offended, or self-satisfied, self-righteous —who does not sometimes yield, when not filled with the Spirit, to these carnalities? The only remedy is to keep constantly filled with the Holy Spirit.

Does not the word "perfect" in the New Testament mean sinlessness?

The word "perfect," as used in the New Testament has

the idea, not so much of sinlessness as of maturity, full growth, "perfect" completion. There are "babes" (1 Cor. 3:1, 2), and full grown ones—mature believers. In Hebrews 10:14 we see our standing in Christ is complete. In Hebrews 6:1 we are exhorted to go on unto completeness in the doctrines of Christ, not ever going back to foundational and elementary things, but on to the more complete, more developed doctrines of which Hebrews is so full. Again, in Philippians 3:12 Paul is thinking of his attainment of, or a complete apprehension of, that for which Christ had apprehended—laid hold of him, and so he presses on toward the prize of the upward calling of God, beginning in regeneration and ending in glory; and then he goes on to exhort those who have, like himself, attained Christian maturity (Phil. 3:13; 1 Cor. 2:6; 14:20), still to press onward to the goal.

What is it to sin against the body (1 Cor. 6:18)?

A sin against the body, such as adultery, or intemperance, or over-indulgence of any kind that injures the body, is a defilement of the temple of God.

The point is that Christ's offering "once for all" has so taken the place of the old offerings that they no longer have any efficacy, and the wilful sinner who has received the knowledge of that truth is shut up to the alternative of receiving Christ as his sin offering or of waiting fearfully for judgment.

What are "presumptuous sins" and what is "the great transgression" (Psalms 19:13)?

"Presumptuous sins" are, according to the literal meaning of the Hebrew word translated "presumptuous," sins due to pride.

"The great transgression" (same verse) is correctly rendered in the Revised Version without the article, "And I shall be clear from great transgression."

What is the unpardonable sin?

The unpardonable sin, referred to in Matthew 12:24-32, and again mentioned in 1 John 5:16 as the "sin unto death," is ascribing to Satanic power, rather than to that of the Holy Spirit, the works of Christ.

There are some who teach that the unpardonable sin is unbelief, but this is not scriptural, for pardon full and free is ready for the unbeliever up to the very hour of his death: John 3:16; 5:40; 6:37; Luke 23:43. The company before the great white throne are not there because their sins were *unpardonable,* except in the rare cases where Matthew 12:31 applies, but because they *rejected the pardon* for sin which God provided in His Son. Therefore it is unscriptural and also a misrepresentation of the character of God to say that unbelief is the unpardonable sin. It is rather blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, as the context of Matthew 12:31 makes clear.

I have been taught that all children are born in Christ. Is this scriptural?

There is no scriptural authority for saying that "all children are born in Christ"—or in fact, *any* children, however godly their parents may be. Psalm 51:5 applies not only to the old dispensation, but to the whole race. This is part of the curse of the sin of our first parents (Rom. 5:18). To be "born in Christ" requires *faith* in Him as a Saviour from sin (Acts 16:31) and acceptance of Him (John 1:12). The last passage makes it clear that belief alone makes one eligible to sonship. From such passages as Isaiah 54:13; Acts 2:39; Acts 11:14, the natural inference is that the children of believing parents will be brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" and that when they too come to "believe" and "receive" they will be taken into the body of Christ by the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

We must accept the statement which Paul makes through the Spirit,—"that which is born of the *flesh* is *flesh* (John 3:6), and that *no flesh* can "be justified in his sight." But to ask whether all children who die in infancy are *saved,* is another question, and in reply I would say that undoubtedly they are, from Jesus' own words in Matthew 18:1-11, and would belong to the company of those who "are Christ's at His coming" (1 Cor. 15:23). There is no scriptural warrant for saying that they constitute part of the "body of Christ," which is His bride. Again, it would be impossible to make a distinction as to the children who die in infancy, as *all* of them are "born in sin," therefore the passages quoted above would seem to include all children who die in infancy.

TONGUES (Speaking in)

What is your opinion in regard to speaking in tongues?

We cannot go into the matter historically except to say that from time to time down the history of the church this very course has arisen and flourished for a time, only to end in disordered minds and wrecked faith in hundreds of cases. Let it be noted, first, that nowhere, from beginning to end of the New Testament, is any human being told to seek the baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire. Christians are told that they have the Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19) and that by one Spirit they are baptized into one body (1 Cor. 12:12, 13). Then Paul exhorts those who have the Spirit to be filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18), but nowhere in all his fourteen epistles, nowhere in the two epistles of Peter, in the three epistles of John, is the Christian exhorted to seek anything in connection with the Holy Spirit.

Second, the true biblical gift of tongues was speaking in languages of men (Acts 2:4-12). The so-called gift of tongues in Los Angeles and other places where it has

sporadically broken out is a mere gibberish. This has been investigated and we say this with absolute assurance of the truth of what we say.

Third, the biblical gift of tongues was in connection with an immediate testimony to unbelievers (see Acts 2:4-12), and with the purpose of bringing them to Christ. These modern so-called "tongues" consist of unintelligible sounds uttered not in the presence of sinners who by those sounds are informed concerning the death and resurrection of Christ and the necessity of salvation through Him, but in gatherings of excited Americans who all understand the English language, and have no evidential value whatever.

Fourth, the use of tongues even in the biblical sense, that is, of speaking languages that were understood by the natives of the different countries where those languages were used,—even that was rebuked by the Apostle Paul in the 14th of 1 Corinthians when indulged in, in gatherings of believers who all understood one language. It was all to no profit, he said, and that certainly marks the present-day manifestations. They are absolutely profitless and do not rise even into the sphere of the disorderly Corinthian manifestations, for these were, as I have said, utterances of languages. The whole thing is another instance and illustration of which there are so many in the history of the church, of Satan's way of pushing earnest and spiritual Christians over the brink of sobriety into fanaticism. Our only safety is to abide by the Bible and to give no value whatever to so-called experiences which are not strictly biblical.

Can Mark 16:17, 18 be used as authority for speaking in tongues, etc.?

Mark 16:9-20 is not found in the two oldest manuscripts, the Sinaitic and Vatican, while others have it with partial omissions and variations.

THE TRIBULATION

What becomes of the Jewish remnant after the rapture of the Church?

During the great tribulation a remnant out of all Israel will turn to Jesus as Messiah, and will become His witnesses after the removal of the Church (Rev. 7:3-8). Some of these will undergo martyrdom (Rev. 6:9-11), some will be spared to enter the millennial kingdom (Zech. 12:6; 13:9). Many of the Psalms express, prophetically, the joys and sorrows of the tribulation remnant.

Will those who have rejected the gospel and are alive when Christ comes, have a chance then to accept Him?

Revelation 7 makes it clear that after the rapture of the Church and during the tribulation not only an elect number of Jews, but also "a great multitude which no man could number," of Gentiles will be saved, and there is no Scripture passage which excludes from the possibility of that salvation those who do not receive Christ before the rapture. But 2 Thessalonians 2:8-12 gives the characteristics of those who will be judged at the return of the Lord in glory. The Scriptures make it manifest that often there is a point, however, in this life, where men become hopelessly hardened in the rejection of truth, and no man can say when he may pass that line. The fact that there will be salvation during the tribulation, therefore, gives no individual rejector of the gospel any ground for hope.

Does not the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins warrant the assumption that pre-rapture hearers will be excluded from salvation after the rapture—i. e., during the tribulation?

The wise and foolish virgins are tested and separated by the coming of the Lord into the air for saints; none

but professors are before us in that prophetic parable; the "door" is shut to those only who have taken the place of profession without reality.

After the departure of the saints, salvation continues up to (at least) the glorious appearing; and, (on the authority of Revelation 7) the number saved includes some out of every "nation," and therefore some out of the so-called "Christian nations." The same enumeration is used in Revelation 5:9, where, beyond all question the praising ones are largely out of the nations of so-called "Christendom." We may search in vain for a single word of Scripture which clearly excludes from the possibility of salvation between the rapture and the return in glory of those who have heard, but have not accepted, the gospel before the rapture. Nothing, as to the exclusion of such hearers, can be predicted upon Revelation 14, for the preaching of the "everlasting gospel" follows the fall of Babylon, and has no connection with the preaching of the remnant; especially during the first three and a half years.

This post-rapture salvation is not a question of inclusion in the body and bride; *that* "door" is the one which is "shut" in Matthew 25:10. The tribulation saints have their own blessing in Revelation 7.

Will any of the saved pass through the tribulation?

There will be many of the saved in the tribulation, and they will pass through it, but probably you mean the Church. None of the saved of this dispensation will be in the tribulation. That many Christians live carnal and worldly lives, is unfortunately true, but we are saved by grace, through faith, and the first resurrection is not a reward for the faithful, but the time of the removal from the earth of all that are Christ's. (1 Cor. 15:20-23; 1 Thes. 4:14.) The result of carnal and worldly living is stated in the 3rd chapter of 1 Corinthians to be a loss of reward. This condition has existed throughout the entire

church age, and if the tribulation is to be a kind of purgatory for the unfaithful Christians at the very end of the age, the question arises, why should they be thus dealt with while all other unfaithful Christians have already gone to heaven and only await the resurrection of their bodies; it would be a discrimination against those who happen to be alive at the time of the Lord's return. The great thing to hold in mind about all this is the absolute unity of the body of Christ. There are many unnourished and undeveloped members of that body, but they are all members of the body, and they have part in the first resurrection because the word is "afterward they that *are Christ's* at His coming."

TYPES

Why is not Canaan a type of heaven, if the crossing of the Jordan is a type of the believer's death?

The crossing of the Jordan is not a type of the believer's physical death, but death or crucifixion in the sense of Galatians 2:20, Colossians 3:3, etc.—death to the old life of sin, from which, having risen, we walk in newness of life—in victory—in the life portrayed in Colossians 3, etc., which life is typified by Canaan, a place,—a life, in which there are still conflicts and defeats (not so of heaven), but marked generally by victory, peace and power.

Is not scriptural typology pressed too far?

The absolutely safe rule is that nothing may be dogmatically asserted to be a type which is not so used in Scripture, *e. g.*, John 3:14; 6:31-33; 1 Corinthians 5:6, 7 (passover and leaven) Hebrews 9, etc. But we may safely look to lives of typical persons, as also to events and institutions for spiritual analogies of great beauty and value. The brides of Scripture come under this head. The types cannot be pressed too far. The beauty of the types is that

the natural order of events was not wrested or changed in order to make a type, else they would have made an unnatural and therefore unacceptable history.

What is the meaning of Leviticus 13:13, which intimates that the worse the disease, the more perfect the cure?

The passage presents at first this difficulty, that it seems to be an advantage for a leper to be completely leprous,—that is, white from head to foot. The explanation is twofold: First, sanitary: so long as there is no raw flesh, leprosy is incommunicable; second, spiritually, leprosy is a type of sin, and the judgment of God is that all men are utterly sinful. When a sinner presents himself as not indeed perfect, but not so bad as he might be, the priest cannot pronounce him cleansed; he is resting in part upon mercy and in part upon his own goodness. But when he takes the place of a leper, completely leprous, then the priest can cleanse him. The type of leprosy in its application seems sometimes obscure, but we are to remember that there is a great mystery in the fact and evil of sin.

How could the Church be both the body and bride of Christ?

See Ephesians 5:30, 31, which is quoted from Genesis 2:23, 24, and excludes the interpretation that the reference is to the Church merely as the body of Christ. Eve, taken from Adam's body was truly "bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh," but she was also his wife, united to him in a relation which makes of "twain . . . one flesh" (Matt. 19:5, 6) and so a clear type of the Church as bride of Christ (see 2 Cor. 11:2, 3).

How do the three brides of Genesis typify Christ's bride?

They are typical analogies, illustrating different aspects of the bride of Christ, the Church,—Eve revealing the

origin, as she was taken from the side of her husband, so the Church was born, so to speak, from the side of Christ pierced by the spear; Rebekah shows the manner of the betrothal and marriage,—won by the Holy Spirit,—and also the Jewish character of the bride in part,—while Asenath shows the time of the betrothal, and also the Gentile origin of the Church-bride.

WOMAN'S MINISTRY

Is it unscriptural for a woman to preach?

There is no verse which says a woman must not preach. Three things are forbidden to women: (1) They must not interrupt meetings where the Holy Spirit is at work, by asking questions (1 Cor. 14:23-35); (2) A woman must not "teach." The word *didaskein* here means, as defined by Thayer, "to deliver didactic discourses"—*i. e.*, to teach doctrinally by authority,—as we would say, dogmatically. It is the same word used of the apostle of himself in 1 Timothy 2:7. A woman must not set herself up as an authority in matters of doctrine, like an apostle (1 Tim. 2:12); (3) A woman must not be put in a place of authority in the church, such as the office of elder would be (1 Tim. 2:12, 13). The ordination of women is an abomination. It should be remembered that two great principles govern the relation of subordination in marriage (Gen. 3:16; 1 Tim. 2:13). The second is like, but has special reference to marriage as a type. The wife is to be in subjection to her husband "as the church is unto Christ." It is obvious that 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35, relates to married women, as also do 1 Timothy 2:12 and Ephesians 5:24. The prohibition to "teach" is, however, general. "I suffer not a woman to teach (authoritatively). So far all is negative. What a woman clearly *may* do is (1) to "prophesy" (1 Cor. 11:5; Acts 21:9). The gift of prophecy is not exclusively nor even chiefly, foretelling,

but forth-telling—speaking to edification, and exhortation, and comfort (1 Cor. 14:3). Such speaking, therefore, is permissible to women. A word as to covering the head in 1 Corinthians 11:5: Nothing could be more contrary to the whole spirit of this dispensation than to use the casual mention of an ancient custom in a Greek city as fastening a legal and, so to speak, Levitical ceremonial upon Christians in all ages. The point is that "the head of the woman is the man." It is the divine order. The angels know this. To them any inversion of that order would be disorder. In Corinth a shorn or "uncovered" head in the presence of men was a badge of harlotry, and a harlot is not only a woman who sells her body, but she is a woman who has thrown off the restraints of subordination—of the divine order. In a mixed assembly, therefore, a spiritually-minded and biblically-taught Christian woman who speaks or prays would do so in a modest and womanly manner, keeping her place in the divine order. It will be obvious, therefore, that, within the limits expressly fixed, and with the spirit of modesty and subordination, a Christian woman may exercise a wide and varied ministry. (2) She may teach, in any sense not involving dogmatic declaration of doctrine; (3) she may speak "to edification and comfort"; (4) she may also pray (1 Cor. 11:5); and, (5) since "him that heareth" is commanded to say "Come," she may evangelize.

SUBJECT INDEX

PAGE

Abraham, the Hebrew..... 88
Adam, a saved man..... 98
Age, Approaching end of.....125
Annihilationism 36, 39
Apochryphal books 81, 82
Apostles and disciples..... 96
Arbitration 27
Assurance 10-15
"Awakenings" in Daniel.....134

"Babylon the great".....121
Baptism, 15-19; after Pentecost, 17; and remission of sins, 19; Believers' and John's, 16; of adults, 19; of believers, 19; of the Holy Ghost, 47-49; with fire, 16.
"Baptized for the dead"..... 16
Beast vision of Daniel 7.....121
Beasts of Daniel and Revelation 123
"Beelzebub" 97
Believers and politics, 35; "falling away," 10; "not under law," 77; Security of, 10-15.
Bible and modern conditions, 32; and science, 147; King James Version, 82; study for young converts, 100.
Blamelessness of law-keepers... 98
Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost 50
Blood of Christ 109
Body and bride of Christ.....158
Book of Job, allegorical..... 98
Book of Revelation 115
Book of Moses inspired..... 54
"Born of water and Spirit"....109
"Bottomless pit" 145
Bride of Christ, 158; Dr. Bullinger's theory of, 34; in Song of Solomon, 30.
Brides of Genesis 158
Bruising Satan's head.....116

Canaan and heaven.....157
Canon of Scripture..... 85
Carnality of believers.....25, 150
Chastisement 92
Children and regeneration.....152
Christ and His bride in Song of Solomon 30
Christ, as "David" in prophecy, 121; as Priest, 111; blood of, 109; example of, 79; fulfilling prophetic office, 110; keeping the law, 79; "made sin of us," 109, 149; "Son of David," 113; Genealogy of, in Matthew and Luke, 112; Rejection of, foretold, 60; sympathy with human nature, 113; Temptation of, 112; Transformation of, 112.
Christian conduct 20-29
Christians and law-suits..... 27
Chronology of Daniel, 94; of Flood to call of Abram, 87.
Church, The, 30-36; and miracles, 33; and social evil, 36; body and bride, 158; in the tribulation, 156; in the O. T., 58; promises, 57; socials, fairs, etc., 23; under grace, 74.
Churches, The seven, in Revelation 31
Circumcision and baptism..... 15
Civic righteousness 35, 36
Commandment, The new..... 73
Commandments, Breaking of, 64; in the N. T., 105.
Commending unjust steward...106
"Communicate," Meaning of... 90
Conditional immortality 36
Conflict of two seeds of Gen. 3.103
Conscience, Dependence on, 26; the light of John 1:9, 102.
Consecration 29, 88
Contradictions, Apparent 9, 10
Conversion and regeneration...109
Converts and Bible study.....100
Covenant, The Deuteronomic... 87
Creation and geology.....147
Crucifixion of the flesh..... 33
Current literature and death.. 40

Daniel, "Awakenings" in, 134; Beast and image visions of, 121; Chronology of crucifixion in, 94; "little horn" of, 122.
"David," applied to Christ, 121; hating his enemies, 22; Sin of, in numbering the people, 98.
"Day, of the Lord" and "of Christ," 62, 126; and Elijah, 120.
Days of Genesis 101
Death, and modern literature, 40; and the eternal state, 36-44; during the millennium, 65; exemption from, 44; in the O. T and N. T., 41; meaning of, in Revelation, 39.
Defiling the temple of God.... 97
Degrees in punishment 44
"Destroy" and "perish"..... 13
Destruction of the flesh..... 90
Deuteronomic Covenant, The.. 87

PAGE

Discerning of spirits..... 90
Disciples and apostles, 96; before Pentecost, 47.
Divine healing 31
Divorce 96
Doctrines, how formulated.... 93
Dragon, The, in Revelation....146
Drinking into one Spirit..... 92
Drummond, Henry 147

Early church and morality.... 31
Earth and heaven, after millennium 117
Earth replenished 101
Eating "what is set before you" 27
Elijah and John Baptist 118
Elijah and "the day of the Lord" 120
End of the age 125, 126
"Entire sanctification" 142, 143, 145, 150
Ephesian disciples 17
Epistle to the Hebrews, its authorship 88
Eradication theory 142
Eternal life, quality or duration 139
Eternal punishment 39
Eternal security of believers.10-15
Eternity and immortality..... 42
Evolution 44-46

Faith, gift of, 46; salvation through, 12.
"Falling away" 10
Figures and their fulfillment.. 65
Filling of the Holy Spirit.49, 51, 52
Fire baptism 16
Flesh, Crucifixion of, 33; Destruction of, 90; in Scripture, 140.
Foolish virgins 67, 107, 155
Foot-washing 28
"Forever," Use of, in Scripture 63
"Forty" in Scripture..... 99
Friends of the bridegroom.... 91
Future, The, and the Scriptures, 37; rewards, 102.

"Gates of hell"..... 30
"Gathered unto the Name".... 33
Genealogical accounts of Christ.112
"Generation" in Matthew 24... 72
Geology and the Bible.....147
Gift of discerning spirits, 90; of faith, 46; of healing, 31.
God, repenting, 10; "Breach of promise" of, 9; Fellow of, 127.
Gospel, of the grace of God, 72; of the kingdom, 72.
Grace, Believers under, 77; Gospel of, 72; Human race not under, 74; Meaning of, 78.
"Great transgression" 151
"Great tribulation" 155-157
Great white throne judgment.. 63

PAGE

Hades and Sheol 43
Harnack and Ritschl.....130
Hatred of enemies 22
Healing, Gift of 31
Heathen, The, 140; Rule of life for, 74.
Heaven, and earth, after millennium, 117; and paradise, 43.
Hebrews, its authorship..... 88
Hell, the "bottomless pit".....145
Hinderer, The 53
Historical Scriptures, The..... 56
Holy Spirit, The, 47-53; after the rapture, 129; baptism and regeneration, 51; Blasphemy against, 50; Filling of, 49, 51, 52; Losing, 49; Partakers of, 14; Sealing of, 50.

Image vision of Daniel, The....121
Immortality and eternity..... 43
Imputed and imparted righteousness 110
Infant baptism 19
Inhabitants of new earth..... 71
Inspiration, 53-56; of the Pentateuch, 54; of the Septuagint, 83; partial, 53; verbal, 55.
Intercession, Abraham's, for Sodom 93
Israel and the Church, 57-61; Blindness of, 59, 60; Earthly blessing of, 102; Place in the future of, 70; Promises to, 57; Regathering of, 70; Rejection of Christ by, 60; Resurrection of, 102; Salvation of, 118.
"Israel of God," The.....58, 61

Jehovah, Compound names of..111
Jesse, Sons of 10
Jewish remnant after the rapture 155
Job cursing God 105
John Baptist, and Elijah, 118; and Jesus, Ministry of, 17.
Jordan, Crossing of 157
Judas at the Lord's Supper, 103; Repentance of, 95.
Judging 22
Judgments, The, 61-63; of great white throne, 63; of heathen, 140; of the nations, 61, 62; the seal, 114; of self, 61.

Kenosis teaching 95
Keswick teaching 143
Keys of Peter 32
"King of Hell" 145
King James version 82
Kingdom, The, 63-72; Development of, 64; Duration of, 63; Leaven in, 107; of God and of heaven, 67, 68; suffering violence, 69.
Knowing Christ after the flesh. 95

PAGE
Laborers in the vineyard.....106
Law and grace 73-80
Law, Fulfillment of, 73; in this dispensation, 73; Keeping of, 77, 79.
Leading captivity captive.....105
Leaven in the kingdom.....107
Leavened bread, Use of, in Lord's Supper 28
Legality answered 79
Leprosy in Leviticus 158
Life eternal, quality or duration 139
Light, before sun, 148; of John 1:9, 102.
Literal fire in punishment..... 39
"Little horns" of Daniel 122
"Lord's day" in Revelation....135
Lord's Prayer 113, 114
Lord's Supper, and Judas, 103; and unleavened bread, 28.
Losing, salvation, 12; the Holy Spirit, 49.

Malachi 4:5 fulfilled in John Baptist 118
"Man, The, who is my fellow".127
Manuscripts, translations, etc.. 81
Marriage feast, The, 106; of Church, 34; of unbelievers, 89.
Millennial temple, Glory of.... 69
Millennium, Human life in, 65; Salvation during, 71; Sin in, 65.
Ministry, of John Baptist and Jesus, 17; of women, 159.
Miracles of Mark 16..... 33
Miscellaneous 86-105
Modern conditions and the Bible 32
Money raised for Lord's work.101
Morality in early church..... 31
Moses, Sin of, in regard to circumcision, 105; striking the rock, 104.

Name of David applied to Christ 121
Names of Jehovah 111
Nations, Judgment of.....61, 62
"Natural Law in the Spiritual World" 147
Nebuchadnezzar a believer..... 91
New Birth, The.....109
New commandment, The..... 73
New earth inhabitants..... 71
New Testament, baptism, 18; promises, 57.
"Nicolaitanism" 89
"Not under law"..... 77
Number "forty" in Scripture.. 99

"Old man" in Scripture usage..140
Old Testament, Allegorizing of, 56; ceremonies, 18; promises, 57, 58; saints and eternal security, 18; saints in the resurrection, 133, 134.

PAGE
Ordinance of foot-washing..... 28
Our holy dead 37, 41, 42

Parables, 106-108; laborers in vineyard, 106; leaven, 107; marriage feast, 106; mustard seed, 67; talents, 14; unjust steward, 106; virgins, 67, 107, 155.
Paradise and heaven..... 43
Partakers of the Holy Ghost... 14
Partial inspiration 53
Partial rapture 127, 128
Paul, and the prize, 140; losing his salvation, 12; visit to Jerusalem by, 82, 92.
"Perfect" in Scripture usage...150
"Perish" and "destroy" in Scripture usage 13
Person and work of Christ.109-113
Peter, the rock, the keys..... 32
Politics and believers 35
Post-millennial, army, 71; teaching, 126.
Prayer 113, 114
Preaching, of women, 159; to spirits in prison..... 99
Pre-Adamite inhabitants.....101
Pre-millennialism pessimistic...120
Pre-rapture hearers 155
Present world system, Believers relation to 35
Presumptuous sins 151
Priestly work of Christ.....111
Prohibition of blood and things strangled 26
Promises to the Church, 57; to Israel, 57.
Prophecy, 114-127; and material universe, 115.
Prophetic dates and their fulfillment, 115; figures and their fulfillment, 65; office of Christ, 110; study and its importance, 119.
Punishment, Degrees in, 44; Eternal, 39; Literal fire in, 39.

Quenching the Spirit..... 50
Quotation from Bernard..... 90

Race, The, not under grace.... 74
Rainbow and science 147
Raising money for Lord's work 101
Rapture, 127-130; before tribulation, 129; partial, 127, 128.
Rationalism 130-133
Reconsecration unscriptural.... 88
Regathering of Israel..... 70
Regeneration, and conversion, 109; and Spirit baptism, 51.
Rejection of Christ foretold... 60
Remission of sins in baptism... 19
Remitting sins, by disciples....149
Repentance, 133, 139; of Judas, 95.
Replenishing the earth 101
Resurrection, 133-135; body, Char-

PAGE

acter of, 135; Israel's part in, 102; of O. T. saints, 133, 135.
Revelation, The, its outline....115
Revelation as to future..... 37
Revised Version 82
Rewards, of believers, 102; of laborers in vineyard, 106.
"Righteous overmuch" 87
Righteousness imputed and imparted 110
Ritschl and Harnack 130
Romans 7 experience 144
Rome, or "Babylon the great".121

Sabbath, The, 135-139; in the N. T., 138; Keeping of, 137, 138.
Salvation, 139, 140, 141; in the O. T., 78; of Adam, 98; of believers, 12; during the millennium, 71; during the great tribulation, 156; of Israel, 118; through faith, 12.
Sanctification 140-145
Satan, 145; Army of, 71; Head of bruised, 116.
Sceptre departing from Judah. 66
Science and the Bible.....146-149
Science and the rainbow.....147
Scripture doctrines, how formulated 93
Scriptural typology 157
Seal judgment, The 114
Sealing of the Holy Spirit..... 50
Security of believers.....10-15
"Selah" in the Psalms 91
Self-consecration 88
Self-judgment 61
Separation 20-22, 24, 26
Septuagint, Inspiration of..... 83
Sermon on the Mount..... 64
Sermon outline of Rom. 6-8.... 74
Seven churches in Revelation, The 31
Seven compound names of Jehovah 111
Sheol and Hades 43
Signs of end of age.....125
Sin, cleansed by blood, 109; in the millennium, 65; in the Scriptures, 140, 149-153; of David, in numbering the people, 98; of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, 9; of Moses in striking rock, 104.
Sinless perfection 143, 150
Sinning against the body.....151
Sins of parents 92

PAGE

Social evils and the church.... 36
Socials, fairs, etc., in the church 23 101
Sodom, Abraham's intercession for 93
"Son of David" 113
Song of Solomon 30
Soul and spirit 88
Speaking in tongues 153-155
Spirits in prison 99
"Sweet savor unto God".....104
Syrophenician woman, The.... 95

Tabernacle and temple, The...100
Tabernacles of Exodus..... 97
Temple of God, Defiling of..... 97
Temptation of Jesus 112
"Ten men" and the skirt of a Jew 70
"The camp" of Hebrews 13:13. 93
"The heavenlies" in Ephesians. 81
"The new earth" inhabitants... 71
Tongues, Speaking in.....153-155
Transformation of Christ.....112
Translations, manuscripts, etc.. 81
Tribulation, The great, 155-157; after the rapture, 129; resurrection, 134; saints, 155, 156; Salvation during, 156.
Trinity, Doctrine of..... 86
"Twelve tribes scattered abroad" 59
"Twenty-four elders, The"....124
Types 157-159

"Under grace" 77
Unjust steward, The.....106
Unleavened bread in the Lord's Supper 28
Unpardonable sin 152
"Until Shiloh come"..... 66
Urim and Thummim..... 97

Verbal inspiration 55
Versions of the Bible..... 82
Virgins, Wise and foolish..67, 155
Vow-making 24

Wilful sin 150
Will of God, How to know..... 23
Wise and foolish virgins.....155
Woman, The, of Rev. 12.....124
Woman's ministry 159
"World" in the N. T..... 91
World separation 26

SCRIPTURE INDEX

PAGE

GENESIS

1:3 148
1:28 101
3:15 .....103, 116
6:6, 7 10
49:10 66

EXODU

4:24 105
33:7 97
40:2 97

LEVITICUS

18:13 158

NUMBERS

1:39 9
14:34 9

DEUTERONOMY

24:16 9
30:10 87

2 SAMUEL

5:8 22
21:1, 2 9

1 CHRONICLES

2:13-15 10

JOB

2:9 105
32:8 92

PSALMS

19:13 151

ECCLESIASTES

7:16 87

SONG OF SOLOMON

..... 30

ISAIAH

40:11 111
53 92
55 57

DANIEL

2 121
7 .....121, 122
8 122

PAGE

ZECHARIAH

8:23 70
13:7 127

HAGGAI

2:7 69

MALACHI

4:5 .....118, 120

MATTHEW

3:11 16
5:19 64
11:12 69
12:27 97
13:33 107
15:21-28 95
16:18 30-32
17:10-13 118
18:20 33
20:1-16 106
22:1-14 106
24:13, 14 120
24:34 72
25:14-30 14
25 .....61, 67, 107

MARK

16:17, 18 .....33, 154

LUKE

3:3 19
16 106

JOHN

1:9 102
3:5 109
3:29 91
11:26 44
13 28
20:23 149

ACTS

2:38 19
15:20 26
17:31 62
19:5 17
20:22 92
21:15 82

ROMANS

6:8 74
6:14 76
7:4 34

PAGE

7 144
11:26 118
14:15 13

1 CORINTHIANS

3:17 97
5:5 90
5:11-13 24
6:1-7 27
6:18 151
7:19 105
8:11 13
9:27 12
10:27 27
12:10 90
12:13 92
15:23 134
15:29 16
15:37-44 135

2 CORINTHIANS

2:15 104
3:14 59
5:16 95
5:21 .....109, 149
6:14-18 20
12:16 100

GALATIANS

5:24 33
6:6 90
6:16 61

EPHESIANS

1:13 50
2:6 81
4:8 105
5:18 50

PAGE

PHILIPPIANS

3:6 98
3:11, 12 127
3:14 140

1 THESSALONIANS

4:16 134
5:23 145

2 THESSALONIANS

1:9 89
2:7 53

HEBREWS

6:4-6 10-14
10:26 150
12:1 41
12:22-24 76
13:13 93

1 PETER

3:19 99

REVELATION

.....115
1:10 135
12:4 146
2:6, 15 89
2:3 31
4 124
7 114
9:11 145
12 124
13 123
17 121
18:4 21
20:4 134
20:13, 14 89